THE Lutheran Quarterly

ume VII MAY, 1955 Number 2

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume VII MAY, 1955 Number 2

CONTENTS

CONFIRMATION INSTRUCTION IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, *Gustav K. Wiencke* 99

JOHANN BRENZ'S LARGER CATECHISM OF 1528 ..... *Elbert Vaughan Wills* 114

PREACHING IN THE SUMMERTIME ..... *Arthur O. Arnold* 128

NOTES AND STUDIES

The Use of *Almah* in the Old Testament ..... *Albert E. Myers* 137
St. Paul's Use of Irony ..... *John Reumann* 140
Lutherans in the Great Economic Depression 145
Windish Lutherans at Home and Abroad ..... *Ernest A. Stiegler* 154
Community in the Liturgy ..... *Francis R. Reinberger* 160
Communism's Tactical Blunders ..... *Walter R. Wietzke* 164
Basic Books for the Clergy ..... *Katherine S. Diehl* 167

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Japan: Lutheran Unity in Japan ..... *B. Paul Huddle* 169
Germany: Werner Elert on Preaching and the Liturgy ..... *Theodore G. Tappert* 171

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Farmer, *Revelation and Religion* (Charles W. Kegley) 174
Gogarten, *Entmythologisierung und Kirche* (Paul Leo) 175
Kantonen, *The Theology of Evangelism* (George Aus) 177
Mourant, *Readings in the Philosophy of Religion* (Harold H. Ditmanson) 178
Bavinck, *The Philosophy of Revelation* (Harold H. Ditmanson) 178
Baron and Blau, *Judaism* (William H. Cooper) 179
Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (William H. Cooper) 180
Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (George W. Forell) 182
Reid, *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (E. Clifford Nelson) 182
Grant, *Hellenistic Religions* (Harlan F. Foss) 183
Jay, *Origen's Treatise on Prayer* (E. Clifford Nelson) 183
Seraphim, *Die Ostkirche* (John Schmidt) 184
Brauer, *Protestantism in America* (E. Clifford Nelson) 185
Loetscher, *The Broadening Church* (Eugene L. Fevold) 186
Hedley, *Christian Worship* (Albert A. Jagnow) 187
Herklots, *How Our Bible Came to Us* (Harvey D. Hoover) 188
Stenberg, *Strövdag* (Carl C. Rasmussen) 188
New World Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures (John V. Halvorson) 190
Kroll, *The Long Quest* (Eugene L. Fevold) 190
Schneider, *Facing the Cross* (Lowell O. Larson) 190
Meyer, *Our Hearts Rejoice* (Lowell O. Larson) 190
Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* 192
Vogelsang, *Luther's Werke, Band V* 192
Cook, *The English Mediaeval Parish Church* 192

CONTRIBUTORS

GUSTAV K. WIENCKE is editor of The Parish School, published in Philadelphia by the Board of Parish Education of the United Lutheran Church.

ELBERT VAUGHAN WILLS, formerly lecturer on the History of Education in the School of Education of New York University, is the author of *The Growth of American Higher Education* (Philadelphia, 1936), and now resides at Gatesville, North Carolina.

ARTHUR O. ARNOLD is professor of Homiletics in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois.

ALBERT E. MYERS is a senior in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

JOHN REUMANN is assistant professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia.

ERNEST A. STIEGLER is pastor of St. John's Windish Lutheran Church in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

FRANCIS R. REINBERGER is professor of Practical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

WALTER R. WIETZKE is pastor of St. James Church (American Lutheran) in Detroit, Michigan.

KATHERINE S. DIEHL, for fifteen years librarian at Texas Lutheran College, is now living in Seguin, Texas.

Reporters on "Life and Thought in World Lutheranism" in this number are B. PAUL HUDDLE, a United Lutheran missionary now on furlough, who is professor of Church History in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Tokyo; and THEODORE G. TAPPERT.

Among the reviewers in this issue are GEORGE AUS, professor of Systematic Theology in Luther Theological Seminary; WILLIAM H. COOPER, professor of the Old Testament in Northwestern Theological Seminary; HAROLD H. DITMANSON, professor of religion in St. Olaf College; EUGENE L. FEVOLD, professor of religion in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota; GEORGE W. FORELL, professor in the School of Religion in the State University of Iowa; HARLAN FOSS, professor of religion in St. Olaf College; JOHN V. HALVORSON, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Theological Seminary; HARVEY D. HOOVER, professor emeritus in the Gettysburg Lutheran Seminary; ALBERT A. JAGNOW, late professor of Church History in Wartburg Theological Seminary; CHARLES W. KEGLEY, professor of Philosophy in Wagner College; LOWELL O. LARSON, pastor of First Lutheran Church, Morris, Minnesota; E. CLIFFORD NELSON, professor of Church History in Luther Theological Seminary; CARL C. RASMUSSEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary; JOHN SCHMIDT, pastor of First English Lutheran Church, Toledo, Ohio.

Confirmation Instruction in Historical Perspective

By Gustav K. Wiencke

CONFIRMATION and confirmation instruction have seen many changes in the long history of the church. These changes reflect varying conceptions of what the church is, as well as the spirit and needs of the times. Often such changes are a barometer of the inner spiritual life of the church, and, in the light of this history, it is to be expected that confirmation instruction will change as new generations are confronted by the Gospel. On the other hand, there is a continuity in the history of confirmation practices. Many customs and practices of today may be traced back to the ancient church. Even though the Reformers of the sixteenth century, by and large, at first rejected the sacrament of confirmation and any similar ceremony, the time came when confirmation was established again as one of the most solemn moments in the life of the congregation.[1]

In the Early Church

Confirmation today preserves elements that were originally part of primitive Christian baptism. This is true because, as the Christian church grew and won converts from paganism, it had to safeguard itself by admitting to baptism only those who had been carefully prepared and instructed. Catechetical teachers were provided for this purpose by special schools set up by bishops. During this period the cate-

1 Among the reference materials consulted in preparation of this study, special mention should be made of the following: Charles Theodore Benze, "Liturgical History of Confirmation," in *Memoirs, . . . Lutheran Liturgical Association,* III, pp. 9-18; *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* under "Konfirmandenunterweisung," "Konfirmation," "Katechismus Unterricht," "Katechetik," "Religionsunterricht"; *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* under "Konfirmation," "Katechese," "Katechismen Luthers"; *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte: Das Altertum,* E. Preuschen & G. Krueger, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1923), and *Das Mittelalter,* G. Ficher & H. Hermelink, 2nd ed. 1929; L. Brenner, "Geschichte und Bedeutung der Konfirmation," in *Lehre und Wehre* (St. Louis, 1905), 64, 124; J. M. Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte des katechetischen Unterrichts in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Gütersloh, 1904-27); J. M. Reu, *Catechetics: Theory and Practice of Religious Instruction* (Chicago, 1927).

chumens were admitted only to the preaching service. The special acts of consecration used to admit "hearers" (catechumens) to the prayers of the church (*genu flectentes*) form the beginning of the present rites of confirmation. Not until just before baptism were the words of the baptismal confession (Apostles' Creed) revealed. Catechumens were received by the laying on of hands, exorcism, and presentation of consecrated salt. Following a rigorous period of prayer, fasting, and confession of sins, they were solemnly baptized (generally by immersion) and admitted to Holy Communion.

In the period between the third and the fifth centuries, catechumens had first to be presented by a sponsor to the bishop for examination and instruction. Then they were allowed to visit the Sunday services. After a three-year period they could, at the beginning of Lent, be listed as catechumens. A very solemn period of fasting, prayers, vigils, public examinations, and renunciation followed. Then they were given the words of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. On the Saturday before Easter they were anointed with oil, dressed in a white *chiton,* and baptized. Only a bishop could add the laying on of hands. Then they were admitted to their first communion. White garments were worn for one week, during which they received catechetical instruction. The instruction was chiefly homiletical and liturgical. Augustine stated its purpose as "through listening to learn faith, through faith, hope, through hope, love." In many of the liturgies of the Lutheran Church the same prayers may be found that were used at the various acts of examination of the catechumens as they passed from stage to stage closer to baptism and communion.

With the reception of great numbers into the church in the fifth century, infant baptism became more general. The old concept of the church as the *congregation of the saved* was altered to the idea of the church as an *institution to mediate salvation.* With these changes the old rigorous disciplines of instruction and adult baptism disappeared. By the beginning of the eighth century baptism was reduced to the reading of a short liturgy by the priest for the benefit of the sponsors. The old pre-baptismal examination became a magic ritual—for example, the priest would examine the ear openings of the child. Then the priest repeated the Creed in place of the child. Baptisms were reserved, as before, for the last week in Lent.

In the Middle Ages

The liturgical shell of the rites of baptism was further elaborated in the Middle Ages, but the old discipline of the catechumenate was forgotten. The church was extended into the Teutonic world, at times by the forcible baptism of masses of people. Confirmation itself became a separate rite, and finally a sacrament (A.D. 1274). Baptism was permitted to the lower clergy, but the special rite of laying on of hands was reserved for the bishop only. This rite was believed to bring down the blessing of the Holy Spirit. The threefold rite of confirmation—seal, anointing, and laying on of hands—was regarded as bestowing the Holy Spirit upon the child for the battle of life. The Greek Church, however, retained confirmation as a sacrament immediately following baptism and administered by any priest.

Parallel to developments in the liturgical rite of confirmation were the practices in religious instruction of the laity. The medieval catechisms, as religious instruction of the common people, were made up of Creed, Lord's Prayer, Decalogue, Double Command of Love, Seven Works of Mercy, Seven Cardinal Virtues, Seven Mortal Sins, and the Seven Sacraments. The method of dictation and recitation was used. There was no concept of a whole system of instruction of children, and no regard for the needs of children. Gerson, in his *De parvulis ad Christum trahendis* (1409-12), was the first to emphasize the need for church instruction of children, and he had to defend his idea against opposition. The religious sects of the Middle Ages, however, with their more intense spiritual life, did stress the instruction of children. By Luther's time the four parts of catechetical instruction were the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria, Apostles' Creed, Decalogue.

In the Reformation

Luther had little to say in his writings about confirmation. While rejecting it as a sacrament, he seems to have been open to retaining it as a sacramental ceremony. The Augsburg Confession rejects confirmation by implication, and the Apology (VII, 6) and the Tractatus (§73) reject it expressly. The Reformers opposed confirmation as lacking in sufficient scriptural basis and as involving superstitious ceremonial. In very few of the church orders of the early period of the Reformation was any provision made for confirmation.

Luther's Small and Large Catechisms, it must be remembered, were not written for confirmation instruction. Rather, Luther sought to meet the desperate need for a general religious instruction of the whole congregation. The two catechisms, accordingly, were directed to the two power centers in the Saxon village—the patriarchal housefather whose word was law, and the parish priest who, though often unlearned, held a position of influence and authority. Luther himself sensed the importance of his Small Catechism, and his contribution cannot be overestimated. He was the first to give the religious instruction of children broad foundations for making them conscious and active members of the church and witnesses to evangelical faith. Even today, the early editions of Luther's Small Catechism present a refreshing and interesting appearance. Luther's original wall posters are no longer extant, but the book editions were illustrated with woodcuts and are typographically handsome in their use of white space and red and black print. To aid in instruction, Luther wrote five hymns to the five parts of the catechism, and rhymed Bible stories were used. His conservative use of the traditional elements of the medieval catechism stressed an organic relationship between the church of the present and its past heritage. In crisp brevity, in easy rhythm of language, in a feeling for what is concrete and essential, Luther's catechism has never been excelled. Any good parish priest could have set up a catechism suitable for Saxon peasants, but it took the evangelical insight of Luther to make the catechism a witness and a key to the Christian faith which was to transcend his century and his age.

In method, however, Luther continued the medieval practice of first memorizing, then explaining, then applying. This method of literal memorization has persisted in catechetical instruction to the present.

Calvin, like the other Reformers, rejected the sacrament of confirmation in no uncertain or complimentary terms. He did speak of the public examination of ten-year-olds as a confession of faith in the presence of the congregation. This was to take the place of the Roman "confirmation."

Melanchthon was less outspoken in the condemnation of confirmation. He thought it could be salvaged as a practical and useful rite. In fact, the practical necessity of regulating who should be admitted to the Lord's Supper led to the eventual re-establishment of confirmation. At first, the catechism was used to instruct those admitted for the first

time to the Lord's Supper, but any special act of confirmation was regarded as an *adiaphoron*. Catechetical instruction was carried on beyond the first participation in the Lord's Supper, which leads the writer to believe that children as young as ten were admitted to Communion at that time.

As a general rule of thumb, the church orders in central Germany (Gnesio-Lutherans) made no provision for confirmation beyond a public examination in the catechism. However, Bucer, in his conflict against Schwenkfeld on infant Baptism, succeeded in introducing confirmation into the agenda of Hesse. It consisted of a profession of faith and a vow to obey the discipline of the church and to live and act according to Christian faith. It culminated in the laying on of hands and prayer for the confirmand. Other "fringe" areas, such as North Germany, Austria, and the Low Countries likewise began to introduce confirmation again—at least on paper. The Lutheran Church of Hamburg, however, delayed introducing confirmation until 1832.

In the Period of Orthodoxy

Since its reception into the Book of Concord (1580) Luther's catechism became a confessional book. Accordingly the bitter theological controversies of the period of Lutheran Orthodoxy greatly influenced catechetical instruction. The much-used instruction book of Conrad Dietrich, *Institutiones catecheticae* (1613) is an example of this tendency. It sought to equip youth with the whole dogmatic armor of Orthodoxy and regarded the reluctance of youth to yield to such instruction as the work of Satan. It was believed that one could defend the pure doctrine of Luther from corruption and make even children into fully armed soldiers against any danger which might threaten the Lutheran Church, whether from within its own ranks, or from Switzerland, or from Rome. The essence of Dietrich's catechism (with some changes and additions) may still be seen in the 610 questions and answers of an American catechism, printed in 1872 and used in English-speaking churches of the Missouri Synod. And Osiander's "Booklet for Communicants" (1590) and J. V. Andreae's "Instruction for Children" (1621) may be traced again in the popular *Württemberg Kinder-Buechlein* which was used in both English and German as the basis for examination in the catechisms of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania.

The form and method of these long, doctrinal catechisms had an influence beyond the Lutheran Church. The catechisms of the Roman Church adopted the same form and method as the Lutheran catechisms and have continued thus to modern times. The purpose of presenting in a catechism a complete outline of theology has characterized the majority of catechisms in the Lutheran Churches of America down into the twentieth century. The author can testify from personal experience to his use of Joseph Stump's Catechism in preparing for synodical examination for ordination. It supplied all the answers needed at points where other candidates, groping in their memories for their textbooks on systematic theology, faltered.

The understandable concern for doctrinal correctness and purity in the period of the Counter-Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, and the internal dissension within Protestantism, led, however, to an abuse of catechetical instruction. The pithy catechism of Luther was overlaid with an intellectualized summary of Orthodox doctrine—surely wearisome and tedious for many catechumens. Trotzendorf (1556), who was regarded as a very accomplished catechete, defined a catechist as a teacher who "repeats orally what is to be learned as often as may be necessary until the pupil can repeat it after him."

In the Period of Pietism

It is to the credit of Philip Jacob Spener that his work led to a general restoration or introduction of confirmation. His intense interest in confirmation instruction earned him the nickname, "Saxon schoolmaster." It was his purpose to "bring the heart into the head" and thus deepen and spiritualize the instruction of youth. He used confirmation instruction to lead children to confess orally to the covenant of baptism, in remembrance of the vow of the sponsors at baptism, and to surrender themselves personally to Christ. A Pietistic view of baptism is evident. This view regarded baptism as more of a *covenant between God and men* than as a *means of regeneration.* Hence infant baptism appeared to be incomplete and defective until completed by a conversion experience. As scriptural basis, I Pet. 3:21 was cited: "Baptism, which corresponds to this [Noah's survival], now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a clear conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." This Pietistic emphasis on

the confirmand's new, personal relationship to Jesus tended to overshadow the relationship to the church which confirmation implies.

Along with this emphasis upon the renewal of the baptismal covenant went a practical concern for personal conduct. Spener wished "that the youth should not only learn to understand what was given them to believe, but also to consider how this should either be a rule for their lives, or a good encouragement to true piety. Hence, in the examination of youth, exhortations are highly desirable which lead one to put into action what has been learned." Francke declared that "one should lead the children in all love and tenderness to a hearty understanding and active Christianity, so that they get the habit of applying the catechism to all they do."

Spener himself, while succeeding in introducing confirmation in the surrounding country parishes, had to be content with private confirmation in his city church in Frankfurt. However, the individualized and subjective form of confirmation so met the needs of his time that it spread rapidly to all parts of Germany, where it had not been known before. More use was made of "Bible history" until it became an independent subject of instruction. Memorization of Bible verses and church hymns was stressed, a feature which characterizes confirmation instruction to the present day.

In method, Spener relied heavily on a word analysis of the catechism. Many of his questions were awkward, unclear, and abstract. He counseled the catechist to put the same question in different forms until the right answer came back from the child. If the answer did not come, the teacher was to say the answer and have the child repeat it. Pietistic confirmation instruction easily became homiletical, sentimental, and hortative. Its method of first memorizing doctrine and then discussing its application divorced the inner relationship of religious insight from the action of the will. The over-stimulation of the emotions was an excess to which Pietism was prone.

The catechisms used by Muhlenberg and those used long after him by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania contained the "orders of salvation" developed by Pietism in Germany. Much used was Ziegenhagen's order of salvation, prepared by the German chaplain in London. One of the four orders of salvation was reduced to nine essentials and appeared in several editions of the catechism beginning in 1749. The influence of Pietism has continued to dominate most Lutheran catechisms in Amer-

ica down through the nineteenth century, and its influence may still be traced today.

A similar and long-sustained tradition may be seen in the catechisms influenced by the Scandinavian Pietist, Pontoppidan. His "Explanation to the Catechism" (1737), which was used first in Denmark and Norway, may still be traced in catechisms currently in use in America. For example, *Luther's Small Catechism Explained in Questions and Answers* (Messenger Press, Minneapolis) is a translation of a catechism by H. U. Sverdrup, pastor of a church in Norway, based in turn on a larger work by the same author which is derived from Pontoppidan's work. This catechism has been adapted for American use, contains 388 questions and answers, is supplied with an excellent glossary, and accompanied by workbooks for junior and senior confirmation classes.

In the Period of Rationalism

It was in the period of Rationalism that confirmation was made a firmly established part of the life of the church. With the spread of public education, confirmation became closely linked with graduation from the elementary school. Thus the child, at fourteen, reached a climax in his progress to maturity—release from school, confirmation, and his first communion. Children were dressed up for the ceremony and marched in solemn procession into the church. Soft, sentimental organ music was played at the prayer of consecration, and many folk customs developed to emphasize the importance of the occasion—congratulatory visits to the parents of the confirmand, gifts, ornate confirmation certificates, etc. Many outward forms of confirmation, observed in Lutheran churches today, can be traced to this period. Developing a personal relationship to the confirmands became a special duty of the pastor. The province of the pastor's confirmation instruction as distinguished from the religious instruction in public schools was to become a subject of argument and discussion.

Rationalism focused attention on the problem, How can one prove religious truths, that is, make them a convincing reality? Instead of viewing confirmation instruction as the transfer of completed religious insights and knowledge into the mind and heart of the child, Rationalism sought to lead the child to grow and develop and so discover new religious truths for himself. Instead of (*a*) memorizing and then (*b*) developing an understanding, the order was reversed. It was felt that

a child should not memorize what he did not understand. A real unity between understanding and knowledge was sought. To this end Mosheim and Dinter developed their well-known "Socratic" catechism. Dinter was a master in putting such plain, specific questions to a child as would make him want to think and find an answer. Material was organized in a clear, appealing manner.

This educational instinct of Rationalism led to less memorizing in catechetical instruction, to the use of the vernacular instead of Latin in the schools, to less use of punitive methods, to a shortening of the catechumens' examination, and to attempts to grade materials for the children.

Brilliant as was the educational method of Rationalism, it left out the meat and substance of confirmation instruction. There was less interest in the Confessions and in preserving pure doctrine. Rationalism focused on three main ideas: God, virtue, immortality. Its result was an abandonment of the evangelical heart of confirmation instruction and a tendency to reduce all religious truths to those which could be grasped by reason. Catechetical instruction thus became a kind of intellectual exercise. And confirmation was regarded as a covenant-pledging on the part of the child himself.

Rationalism did not leave the Lutheran Church in America untouched, but almost so. Much cited is Frederick Henry Quitman's *Evangelical Catechism: or A Short Exposition of the Principal Doctrines and Precepts of the Christian Religion, for the Use of the Churches belonging to the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of the State of New York* (1814). It begins with catechumens rehearsing the Apostles' Creed. "1 Q. Why are the preceding articles called the Apostolic Creed? A. Because the doctrines contained in them strictly agree with the gospel, handed down by the Apostles of our Lord. 2 Q. What signifies the expression: To believe in any thing? A. To take it for granted; to be convinced of its truth. 3 Q. Can any rational belief take place without a sure foundation? A. No, all unwarranted belief is superstition. 4 Q. Which are the grounds that ought to constitute the basis of rational belief? A. Either natural perception and experience; or the authority of competent witnesses; or finally, unquestionable arguments of reason." This catechism takes up the Creed, Decalogue, Lord's Prayer, Sacraments, and "Of the Final Destiny of Man." Though the author himself was highly regarded, his catechism had very limited influence. Not long

after, there appeared Charles A. Smith's *The Catechumen's Guide* (Albany, 1837). It was a carefully reasoned, clearly written exposition of Luther's Catechism in an earnest defense of confirmation as over against the revival method in the "burned over region" of New York. While the author's language betrays the influences of the Enlightenment, a strong, evangelical foundation is apparent. Unfortunately, Smith's book was little heeded and is virtually unknown.

It is in the outward customs of confirmation rather than the inner content, and in the stress on educational method, that we can see the influences of Rationalism in Lutheran confirmation down to the present day. The educational novel, *Vater Roderich unter seinen Kindern* (1803), is a vivid description of the essence of religion in the experience of a child. Its more recent counterpart is *The King's Garden* by John Helmer Olson (1929), which presents stories and pictures to kindle the imagination and to make the catechism interesting—without, however, abandoning its evangelical content.

In the Nineteenth Century

We have seen how Luther's Small Catechism became embedded in a mass of dogmatic and ethical instruction. Indeed, only toward the end of the nineteenth century was it finally lifted out of this accumulation and understood in its original meaning. It was not Luther's intent to offer a system of doctrine but rather to introduce the Christian to the essence of evangelical Christianity by means of the traditional articles of the church. This he approached under three viewpoints—Christian life, Christian faith, Christian prayer. And in the fourth and fifth parts he sought to make the sacraments inwardly understood by the recipient —all this as the witness of an evangelical and personal relationship of love and faith to God and to one's brother.

This appreciation of the catechism developed in a time when the catechism was seriously questioned. Thus Claus Harms, the vigorous Lutheran opponent of Reformed influences in the church and the foremost critic of the Rationalism of his time, at first abandoned Luther's catechism as no longer suited on religious, psychological, and ethical grounds. In his catechism of 1809 Harms ventured to draw up his own decalogue and creed and to develop his own pattern of seven parts—Commandments, Word of God, sacraments, holy things, prayer, and last things. "We know," he says in his preface, "out of what branch of science such procedure (*a*, explain; *b*, prove; *c*, apply) has come into our

pedagogy. But it should never be permitted, neither there nor here, and here least of all. I go beyond those authorities and say, No one has ever *taught* thus who has taught the people. There is a teaching, however, which does not prove, does not apply or make memorable, and yet does in one unity what we strain to do in three parts. Until we understand that, our teaching—God help us—will generally be of no use."

There were others who also questioned the usableness of Luther's catechism. Sometimes this criticism took not the form of honest rejection, such as Harms's, but the form of insertions and re-interpretations. The Decalog was expanded to a system of evangelical ethics in connection with the Sermon on the Mount. The way of salvation was stressed, and there were various experiments in re-arranging the parts of Luther's catechism—attempts which gave the theoretician more pleasure than the confirmand, no doubt. One grave weakness of these catechisms was that they offered no clear, sure basis for the further religious instruction of the confirmand.

On the other hand, the nineteenth century saw the development of theories of catechetics as a part of practical theology. In this connection we recall, among others, the names of Schleiermacher, T. Harnack, Palmer, and Zezschwitz in Germany. Some of these theoretical developments of catechetics were influential in American Lutheran churches. Two of them, which have come to the writers' attention, deserve mention —Caspari and Kaftan. Caspari, in his *Geistliches and Weltliches zu einer Volkstümlichen Auslegung des kleinen Katechismus Lutheri in Kirche, Schule und Haus* (1853), sought to find a way to make the catechism understood and remembered by the common man. It is a collection of proverbs, aphorisms, anecdotes, and allegories for use with the catechism. The catechism by William Julius Mann and Gottlob F. Krotel (1863) was based on Caspari's catechism and widely used. Kaftan's catechetical method was made known in America by J. W. Horine in his *The Catechist's Handbook* (1909).

Along with this development of catechetical theory went a historical study of Luther's catechisms and the catechisms of the Reformation era. J. M. Reu's monumental work on the catechisms of the Reformation era is an authority on both sides of the Atlantic. His historical studies were accompanied by other books ranging from catechisms for use in confirmation instruction to a seminary text on catechetics. Reu, in his *Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism,* translated from the German (1904), set forth his principles for the catechist. Dogmatic

additions to the catechism were removed and the five parts were not to be treated as a system. Only Luther's "paraphrase" (not the text itself) should be the object of explanation. Children should be encouraged to think independently, and teaching should be graded to their level. The catechist should begin with the text of the catechism. A given part should be analyzed by the pupil with the help of the teacher, and then developed in conversation between pupil and teacher so as to terminate in the printed explanation. Then the children were to open the catechism and read the section or have the teacher read it to them. The printed page was to be used for review and home study. In very simple terms, Reu summarized the purpose of the catechism: "Here I learn how I become a child of God and how I may remain one." A total of 346 memory verses were cited, and a supplement offered material on the Bible, the church year, and church history.

In Germany there was lively discussion on a number of issues. One was what purpose should distinguish religious instruction in the public schools from confirmation instruction by the pastor, and whether the use of the catechism could be defended as good educational procedure. Another, more serious problem, was that of the honesty of confirmation. Even in our own free churches, pastors have had to choose the "lesser evil" of confirming children who, they knew, would not take the vow seriously or really pass the examination, rather than risk alienating both the children and the parents from the church. This was all the more true in state churches, where confirmation was the result of social pressure rather than inward conviction and personal confession of faith. Stoecker proposed that confirmation be reformed as follows: (1) The conclusion of religious instruction should be celebrated by a simple ceremony with the laying on of hands, but neither the vow nor the confession of the creed should be required. (2) Admission to the Lord's Supper should be granted after a personal interview with the pastor. (3) A voluntary confession of faith and a vow by adults should qualify them to participate in the organizational life of the congregation. Needless to say, Stoecker's proposal was never acted upon, but it illustrates the problem.

In the year-by-year confirmation instruction of this century, however, the old methods of memorization, analyzing, and dogmatic teaching were followed. And in most sections of the Lutheran Church, Luther's catechism formed the substance of catechetical instruction.

In the Twentieth Century

The relevance to life has been the object of much catechetical instruction of the present century. In Germany some went so far as to say that the catechism as a whole offers a questionable basis for catechetical instruction. However, so firmly entrenched was Luther's catechism as a confessional book and as a skeleton for traditional confirmation instruction that it could not be shaken loose.

Along with attempts to make catechetical instruction relevant went attempts to apply modern pedagogical theory and method. This reveals an unresolved tension. How can the authoritative form of the catechism fit into modern educational method? Joseph Stump, in his *Explanation of Luther's Small Catechism, A Handbook for the Catechetical Class* (1907), did not concede much to educational method. He rejected the idea that we should only explain Luther's explanation and defended the inclusion of additional matters under appropriate heads. However, he did abandon the hundreds of questions and answers in favor of the "thetical" method. "Christian truth is not something to be brought forth from the mind of the child by means of questions but something divinely revealed and hence to be communicated to the child," he declared in his preface.

The two-year confirmation instruction plan of Jacob Tanner (Junior and Senior books, Augsburg, 1943) provides for a study of the Bible in the first year and a study of the catechism in the second, integrated into a "Way of Salvation." It features the steady use of memory work, the reading and underscoring of Bible passages, the use of the discussion method, and a personal application to the pupil. Format, typography, and permanent binding make the books attractive. Henry P. Grimsby's *Explanation of the Catechism* (Augsburg, 1941) continues the tradition of the Scandinavian catechisms of the past with strong use of Bible stories, answers to questions in the first person, memorization of hymns and prayers, and a question and answer method in which the answer repeats the question. *A Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism, A Handbook of Christian Doctrine* (St. Louis, 1943) surveys the essentials of Lutheran doctrine in 331 questions and answers, interspersed with Bible verses printed in full, and occasional line cuts of symbols. The questions are pointed, clear, and stress a personal reference of the catechism.

Another approach is seen in the catechetical materials prepared

by O. F. Nolde. "The Small Catechism lends itself most readily to the application of approved pedagogical methods," states Dr. Nolde. "It leads very directly to the awakening or strengthening of essential Christian experience." What these materials seek to do is to arrange and "present the essentials of Christianity in a manner most likely to result in Christian experience. Purpose of confirmation instruction, accordingly, is to take the five basic elements of Christian experience (in the catechism) and make them the personal experience of each pupil. The catechism itself is the framework around which the ever deepening and broadening experience of the maturing Christian can be built." The materials for the two-year course include reading and work books for the pupil on a survey of the Bible, and a study of the catechism, tests, and a catechist's manual. It represents one of the most thorough-going, clearly articulated applications of modern pedagogy to catechetical instruction.

A concern to integrate confirmation instruction into the overall plan of religious education in the church schools is apparent in America. There has been a development of educational devices, such as filmstrips, tests, workbooks, graded lessons for pre-confirmation years, as well as a facing of the problem of continued religious instruction beyond confirmation.

In Lutheran churches of Germany we note a deep change in confirmation instruction beginning in the 1930's and intensified by the experience of World War II and the conflict with Communism. The old heritage from the Reformation in hymn and confession took on new life. Confirmation itself became a costly Christian witness in eastern parts of the Lutheran Church. As Christians were driven to the barest essentials of their faith the catechism took on new meaning as a common bond of unity and witness.

Oskar Ziegner, *Die Kirche vor ihrer Jugend: Die Theologie des kleinen Katechismus* (1949) illustrates the new tone. He rejects the pre-war tendency to make the catechism lively and interesting by the use of Bible stories. He questions the assumption that stories are, of themselves, more readily understandable while doctrine needs to be related to something concrete and tangible so as to be understood. Instead, he views the catechism as the right means to mediate a biblical doctrine of faith. It is a call to decision, and the task of catechetical instruction is to bring youth to a decision in view of a Word that demands obedience

—an obedient hearing and believing, a life lived under the Law and the Gospel. It is from this basic existential reality (what one is, what one's relation to God and man is) that the Bible may truly be understood. Hence the question and answer form of the catechism is a proper one, for it involves us in the need, as catechists (whether pastors or parents), to witness and as catechetes to make the fundamental and basic decision of a man before God.

Three Basic Views of Confirmation

The basic elements of confirmation have a long liturgical history —renunciation of the devil (exorcism), profession of faith and vow, prayer (intercession), and laying on of hands. However, the understanding of what confirmation means has varied with the views currently held as to the meaning of baptism and the Lord's Supper, as well as the meaning of the church.

Three basic views of confirmation may be traced back to the sixteenth century. In fact, they still persist in Lutheran churches today, though not always sharply distinguished. The first is that of *indoctrination*. The promise made by the sponsors at Baptism to bring the child up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, etc., is absolved with confirmation. Confirmation instruction has the purpose of indoctrinating the child with the faith of the church so that the child will be prepared to receive the Lord's Supper on his own responsibility. This view of confirmation stresses preliminary examination and profession of faith.

Another view may be called the *sacramental*. It highlights the liturgical prayer and laying on of hands. It sees in confirmation a peculiar bestowal of grace and salvation, completing, as it were, the sacrament of baptism. This view was held by Schleiermacher and was congenial to Pietism. Confirmation thus appears as a renewal of the covenant of baptism. This view stresses the ritual and solemnity of confirmation. Upon analysis, it sometimes indicates a hidden or unconscious distrust of the complete efficacy of infant baptism.

A third view may be called the *church membership* emphasis, laying stress on the vow taken at confirmation. It is more likely to arise in a state church, where a need is felt to separate the congregation of earnest believers from the rest. This view appears in such conceptions of confirmation as highlight preparation for church membership and participation in the organizational life of the congregation.

Johann Brenz's Larger Catechism of 1528

By Elbert Vaughan Wills

JOHANN BRENZ (1499-1570), the Swabian reformer, whose adherence to the Lutheran movement began with his meeting with Luther at Heidelberg in 1518, served the cause of the Reformation in the imperial city of Schwäbisch-Hall from 1522 to 1548. When obliged to flee from Hall following the overthrow of the forces of the Smalcald League at the battle of Mühlberg, he found refuge in Württemberg and became principal adviser in religious affairs, first to Duke Ulrich, the territorial ruler, and later to his successor, Duke Christopher. Brenz published, in 1528, a small volume comprising two catechisms, which, as examples of compendiums of religious instruction from the early Reformation period, are of interest to students of church history and religious education at the present day. They were not the first catechisms prepared by the reformers. In 1520 Luther had published his *Short Form of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer,* upon which was based his *Little Prayer Book* (*Betbüchlein*), published in 1522. In his *German Mass* of 1526 he recommended the use of the *Little Prayer Book* as a basis for the training of the young in religion. Brenz's manual, in fact, is the 27th in the generally chronological listing of the 39 catechetical writings, or closely related groups of such writings, dealt with by Ferdinand Cohrs in his elaborate study and collection of catechetical literature from the inception of the reform movement up to the publication of Luther's *Small Catechism.*[1]

In 1526 Brenz prepared for the city of Hall a church order for establishing the Reformation within the jurisdiction of the imperial city.[2] His catechisms apparently grew out of the needs which were encountered in Hall in the maintenance of religious training in accordance with the new conditions. In the issue of a pair of catechisms, one for the use of children or for very elementary instruction, and the other for

1 F. Cohrs, "Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion," *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica,* Bde. XX-XXIII und XXXIX (Berlin, 1900-1907).

2 A. L. Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts,* 2 Bde. (Weimar, 1846), I, pp. 40-49.

a more advanced level, Brenz anticipated the similar distinction of levels in Luther's two catechisms, which appeared in 1529. Brenz's manual bore the title, *Fragstuck des christenlichen glaubens für die Jugendt zu Schwebischen Hall.* The *Smaller Catechism* dealt, in 22 questions and answers, with the five chief parts: Baptism, Creed, Commandments, Prayer, Supper.[3] The *Larger Catechism* was confined to the explication of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. The chief parts are not given in unitary form as in the *Smaller Catechism,* familiarity with their phraseology being apparently presupposed. The 86 questions are minutely analytical and concern the interpretation of the subject matter and its significance for the believer.

Following the publication of Luther's *Small Catechism,* Brenz prepared a still shorter catechism, which was published in 1535 under the title, *Fragstück des Christlichen glaubens für die Jugendt.*[4] Through its incorporation in the Württemberg church orders, this became the official catechism of that duchy. The Württemberg Church Order of 1559, the earliest of the territorial church orders of the Reformation period to provide for a system of schools extending from the elementary level to the university, required the use of a revised form of the catechism of 1535 in the vernacular elementary schools, both as a school reader and as a manual of religious instruction.[5]

In connection with the catechism of 1535 Brenz referred to "questions for children" previously put forth under his name and added that the later catechism was drawn up "with the counsel and consent of our pastors and other members of church staffs."[6] This statement has given rise to the conjecture that the catechisms of 1528 were published without Brenz's consent, either from notes made by others from his catechetical instruction, or from copies of the catechisms circulated in manuscript. While this possibility remains, and is given a certain measure of plausibility by discrepancies in the *Larger Catechism,* there is no reason for doubt that the catechisms represent substantially the teaching of the reformer.

3 "Johann Brenz's Smaller Catechism of 1528," trans. Elbert V. Wills, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Vol. XIX (1946), pp. 271-280.

4 "Johann Brenz's Catechism of 1535," trans. Elbert V. Wills, *The Augustana Quarterly,* Vol. XXVI (1947), pp. 291-304.

5 Richter, *op. cit.,* II, pp. 198-222.

6 Cohrs, *M. G. P.,* XXII, pp. 133-134.

In evaluating Brenz's *Larger Catechism* in comparison with the doctrinally stronger treatment of catechetical material by Luther, the present-day reader is impressed by the devoutness and spirituality manifested by Brenz, who sought to provide a simple, concise, and practical manual of religious instruction and a guide to the daily practice of Christian living. In his Jena dissertation on "The History of Religious Instruction in the Evangelical Volksschule of Württemberg," Weisenböhler says concerning the *Larger Catechism*:[7] "Particularly unique, however, in this catechism is the ingenious entwining of the Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. Brenz has woven the two into each other in such wise that the second Commandment is combined with the first Petition, the third and fourth Commandments with the second Petition, the third Commandment with the third Petition, the seventh Commandment with the fourth Petition, the fifth Commandment with the fifth Petition, the sixth, ninth, and tenth Commandments with the sixth Petition. The seventh Petition is given alone, and the Doxology forms the conclusion of the whole. That this combination is not entirely self-explanatory the booklet itself demonstrates; for the first and eighth Commandments are not considered, and the fourth Commandment only slightly dealt with. Also such an intertwining may be, for the instruction of the people, perplexing rather than explanatory. But the attempt is ingenious, and in a measure spiritual."

The following is a translation of the *Larger Catechism*.[8]

INSTRUCTION AND EXPOSITION ON THE TWELVE ARTICLES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH, THE LORD'S PRAYER, AND THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, ALL IN SHORT QUESTION FORM, PREPARED FOR THE INSTRUCTION OF ADULTS AND OLDER PERSONS

The Exposition of the First Article

1. *What is faith?*
   Answer. It is a confidence and trust in the really true, living God.
2. *How many gods are there?*
   Answer. There is but one God.
3. *How many persons are there?*
   Answer. Three.

7 Oskar Weisenböhler, *Geschichte des Religionsunterrichts in der evangelischen Volksschule Württembergs* (Marbach, 1903), p. 3.

8 Translated from Cohrs, *M. G. P.*, XXII, pp. 159-185.

4. *What are their names?*

Answer. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

5. *What is God?*

Answer. He is a Lord who is long-suffering, of great mercy, forgives sin and transgression, holds none blameless, and visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation.

6. *Why in the Creed do you call God a Father?*

Answer. Because He has chosen me as his child, and has promised to me fatherly faithfulness, good will, and all good things; also through his Son, Jesus Christ, he has made me an heir of all his benefits.

7. *Why do you call God Almighty?*

Answer. Because he is able not only to do all things, but also creates, brings about, accomplishes, and regulates all things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth.

8. *Why do you say, "maker of heaven and earth?"*

Answer. Because from the beginning he not only created heaven and earth, but besides, up to this day, imbues, sustains, and rules them.

9. *What benefit do you derive from believing in God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth?*

Answer. This benefit: that I, through faith, receive our Lord God as my highest good, and receive good fortune or ill from his hand, as he bestows upon me all grace and mercy as his creature, and as he will sustain me, even to everlasting life.

10. *Is God also visible?*

Answer. No.

11. *Whence, then, do you know God?*

Answer. From the preaching of his only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is written: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John 1:18).

The Second Article

12. *What do you mean when you say, "I believe in Jesus Christ?"*

Answer. I mean that I believe that the Son of God, who became man, is according to his name a true Jesus, which, according to our German means a Saviour, and is also the true Messiah or Christ, that is, the anointed King and Priest, the solace and salvation of all the world.

13. *Why do you say, "his only Son?"*

Answer. Because Christ was begotten [*geborn*] of his Father from eternity, true God, not after human fashion but in a divine and incomprehensible manner.

14. *Why do you say, "our Lord?"*

Answer. Because he has been made unto us by God for our wisdom, righteousness, and redemption (I Cor. 1:30). Also because he was given to us as a light, a way, a door, a propitiation, and a mediator, whereby we may approach the invisible throne of the heavenly Father (John 8-12; 14:6; 10:7; I John 2:2; I Tim. 2:5).

The Third Article

15. *Why do you say, "who was conceived by the Holy Ghost?"*

Answer. Because Christ was conceived, not from any human seed with sin, as other men, but by the Holy Ghost without sin.

16. *Why do you say, "born of the Virgin Mary?"*

Answer. Because Mary became, through the power of God, the veritable, true mother of Christ, and still retained her virginity inviolate.

17. *What is the value to you of this article?*

Answer. Its value to me lies in this: that my sinful conception is not imputed to me as sin before God's judgment, and my sinful birth is blessed through Jesus Christ to holiness.

The Fourth Article

18. *Why do you say, "suffered under Pontius Pilate?"*

Answer. Because Jesus Christ, in the time of the Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate, under Emperor Tiberius, in the land of Judea, endured his holy passion.

19. *What is the value to you of this clause?*

Answer. That his passion is a satisfaction before the divine judgment for my sin, and through his passion all my suffering is blessed and hallowed.

20. *Why do you say, "was crucified?"*

Answer. Because Jesus Christ, on a shameful gibbet, which we call a cross, was put to death as an evil-doer.

21. *What is the value to you of belief in this clause?*

Answer. That all dishonor, shame, cross, temptation, execration, and calamity, through his crucifixion, are hallowed to me.

22. *Why do you say, "dead?"*

Answer. Because he, on the cross, yielded up his spirit, as any other man, and was overtaken by death.

23. *What is the value to you of belief in this affirmation?*

Answer. It avails me much that he, through his death, has vanquished the power of death and removed the tyranny of sin, and has brought it about that death has become to me henceforth, not an entrance to hell, but a door to blessedness.

24. *Why do you say, "buried?"*

Answer. Because he was, after his death, laid in a new tomb at the city of Jerusalem by Joseph and Nicodemus.

25. *What is the value of this affirmation?*

Answer. That with him sin, death, and all disaster are buried, and also that as we ourselves are buried with him, "so we also should walk in newness of life," as Paul says (Rom. 6:4).[9]

9 The 25th question and answer are lacking in the Latin translation. Cf. Cohrs, *M. G. P.*, XXII, p. 164.

The Fifth Article

26. *Why do you say, "he descended into hell?"*

Answer. Because the Spirit of Christ descended into hell as Christ himself says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (Ps. 16:10).

27. *What is the value to you of this clause?*

Answer. That even if the pain of hell should beset a believer, as happened to Job, David, and Hezekiah, he may nevertheless not be swallowed up thereby, because Jesus Christ our Lord, by his descent into hell, has annihilated the power of hell for believers, but not for unbelievers (Job 17:13; II Sam. 22:6; Ps. 18:6; Isa. 38:10).

28. *What do you mean when you say, "the third day he rose again from the dead?"*

Answer. I confess thereby that Christ, on the third day after his death, by divine power was raised from the dead and entered upon a new life.

29. *What is the value to you of belief in this clause?*

Answer. First, it shows me that I, through the resurrection of Christ, may rise again in soul from sin and walk in a new life, as Paul says, "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life," etc. (Rom. 6:4). And further: "Who was delievered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4.25). Secondly, that I also shall be resurrected in the body at the Last Day, as Paul bears witness and says: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? . . . But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 15:12, 20-22).

The Sixth Article

30. *How do you understand the clause, "he ascended into heaven?"*

Answer. That forty days after his resurrection Christ ascended and was received into a cloud (Acts 1:9). Not that he then entered into heaven for the first time and assumed a corporeal place therein, but that he, by his ascension into the corporeal heaven, made it manifest that he, after his resurrection, had put aside this mortal condition and that he has assumed divine and heavenly life and nature and lives in the glory of his Father.

31. *But into what heaven did Christ go?*

Answer. Christ remained in no corporeal heaven or in no particular part of heaven alone. But as Paul says, "He . . . ascended up far above all heavens" (Eph. 4:10). And: "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (Heb. 7:26).

32. *Why is heaven so described that we say, "ascended into heaven?"*

Answer. Heaven stands here for highness, or all that is on high, as in the Gospel birds are referred to as being in heaven, and as we say concerning the tower of Babel that it extended to heaven, that is, upward and on high (Matt. 6:26; Gen. 11:4).

33. *What is the value to you of belief in this clause?*

Answer. It brings to me this value: that because Christ has entered into his Father's kingdom and has surmounted all heaven, I am certain that he fulfills all things and particularly preserves and endows his present believers, and bestows upon them all good things through the Holy Ghost, as Paul says, "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things" (Eph. 4:10).

34. *How many kinds of heaven are there?*

Answer. Two kinds. There is a corporeal heaven and a spiritual heaven.

35. *What is the corporeal heaven?*

Answer. The corporeal heaven is that to which the planets and stars are affixed, which the Scripture calls firmament (Gen. 1:6-8). So also is all that is above—as air, clouds, etc.—called heaven according to the Scripture.

36. *What is the spiritual heaven?*

Answer. It is eternal joy, immortal life, with all good things that can be named. In this spiritual heaven God and the angels dwell, with the elect of Christ still on earth, as Paul says, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ," and, "For our conversation is in heaven" (Eph. 1:3; Phil. 3:20).

37. *How do you understand the clause, "and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father almighty?"*

Answer. Thus: that Christ, according to human nature, took upon himself the almighty power of his heavenly Father and reigns in all places where God reigns, as it is written, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands" (Ps. 8:6). Likewise, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18). Moreover, "Thou hast put all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:6).

38. *What, then, is the right hand of God?*

Answer. The right hand of God is his almighty power, as it is written, "The right hand of the Lord is exalted: the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly" (Ps. 118:16). "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:27, 28).

39. *What is the value to you of belief in this clause?*

Answer. It is profitable to me in that I, in all temptations and adversity, in life and in death, may straightway and courageously venture to depend upon and to trust my Lord Jesus Christ as a present helper and support, and none, neither angel nor principality nor any other creature, may draw me away from his love and powerful hand. Moreover, I am certain that I have an advocate before the face of God, interceding for my sins (Rom. 8:34; Heb. 9:24).

The Seventh Article

40. *How do you understand the article, "from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead?"*

Answer. Thus: that our Lord Christ, at the Last Day, even in such form

and figure as he was seen by his disciples to have ascended from the mountain, shall manifest himself again, not as if he were not now with us and will then come for the first time, but that he, after he shall secretly and invisibly fulfill all things and reign in all places, shall appear visibly and manifest himself and pronounce judgment: to the righteous, eternal life; to the wicked, eternal damnation.

41. *What do you understand by "the quick and the dead?"*

Answer. Some understand by the quick the Jews, who have worshiped the true and living God, and by the dead the Gentiles, who have worshiped dead idols. Moreover, that by the dead may be understood the Gentiles we base upon John 5:25, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead" (that is, the Gentiles) "shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." Thus also St. Peter understands by the dead the Gentiles, when he says: "For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead" (I Peter 4:6). But that by the quick the Jews are understood we infer from the fact that they have honored and worshiped the living God. Yet some understand by the dead those having passed from life, and by the quick those who shall be overtaken by the Last Day while still alive, of whom Paul writes, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump" (I Cor. 15:51-52).

42. *What of value do you learn from belief in this article?*

Answer. First, I learn from it the fear of God, to turn aside from sin, that I may not be cast with the damned into everlasting fire. Secondly, I take great joy that such judgment, which is pronounced over me for my misery and wretchedness and which I must endure here on earth, will place upon me a perpetual crown of glory, as Paul says, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing" (II Tim. 4:7-8).

The Eighth Article

43. *What is the Holy Ghost, as when you say, "I believe in the Holy Ghost?"*

Answer. He is the third person in the divine Being.

44. *How is the Holy Ghost known?*

Answer. By his works.

45. *What are the works of the Holy Ghost?*

Answer. To give comfort, to bear witness to Christ, to assure the conscience, to mortify the works of the old Adam, to call upon God and to invoke him as Father, and to bear witness in us that we are the children of God.

The Ninth Article

46. *What do you mean when you say that you believe in "the holy Christian Church?"*

Answer. I mean that it is a common congregation of the elect of God, who,

although they are dispersed in various regions and in many dominions throughout the world, nevertheless are united with one another in "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" (Eph. 4:5-6).

47. *What is the meaning of a church in our German tongue?*

Answer. An assembly, not of stone and wood, but of the people of God.

48. *What, then, is "the communion of saints?"*

Answer. It is none other than an explanation of the preceding clause, namely, that the saints (that is, the believers in Christ, who according to the manner of the apostolic Scripture are therefore called saints because the Holy Ghost through faith has begun to work divine saintliness in them) have their divine possessions together and hold their inheritance in common as coheirs of a heavenly Father.

The Tenth Article

49. *Why do you say that you believe in "the forgiveness of sins?"*

Answer. Because Christ died for sin and forgives the sins of everyone who believes in him, not once only in baptism, but as often as the believer has fallen from weakness and again amends his ways. And I do not believe in papal indulgences, but in Jesus Christ, and thus the fruit of this article comes to us from faith in the sorrows of Jesus Christ.

50. *Whence comes the forgiveness of sins?*

Answer. The forgiveness of sins was gained through Jesus Christ with his death on the cross. But it is offered and ministered to us through the Gospel and the two evangelical sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and comprehended by us through faith, confirmed by the Holy Ghost in us, and made use of and appropriated through amendment of life.

The Eleventh Article

51. *Why do you believe in "the resurrection of the body?"*

Answer. Because I believe that not alone here in this world may the soul rise from sins unto godliness, but likewise that at the Last Day all men shall be resurrected in the body from the dead, the righteous to felicity, the wicked to damnation.

52. *Why do you believe this?*

Answer. Because Jesus Christ, on the third day, rose from the dead.

53. *With what body shall we rise from the dead?*

Answer. With precisely the present body, but in another figure and manner, namely, that this corruptible body must put on an incorruptible nature and the mortal must put on immortality, and as we now have a natural, terrestrial body, we shall in the resurrection be clothed with a heavenly, spiritual body. Hence as we bear the image of the earthly Adam, we shall then bear the image of the heavenly Jesus Christ, not that we shall become natural man and God, as Christ, but that we shall possess a spiritual body after the manner of Christ in the resurrection, and thus live in eternal joy and felicity (I Cor. 15:42-49).

The Twelfth Article

54. *Why do you believe in "the life everlasting?"*

Answer. Because "we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (I Thess. 4:15-17).

55. *What shall we do in the eternal life?*

Answer. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (I Cor. 2:9; cf. Isa. 64:4).

Short Questions on the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments

56. *Why do you call God, our Lord, a Father?*

Answer. Because he has adopted me in the relation to himself of a child, has promised to me very liberally all the benefits of a Father, and has bestowed upon me the inheritance of his goods as is meet for a child. And in saying this I confess that I worship no other god than the true and living God and heavenly Father.

57. *Why do you say that he is in heaven, as he is indeed in all places?*

Answer. In distinction from my earthly father. For each person has two kinds of father: an earthly, to whom, according to the command of God, he shall be obedient; and a heavenly Father, to whom in all things without exception he should be submissive. On that account he must also forsake the earthly father when the latter acts contrary to God.

The First Petition Combined With the Second Commandment of God

58. *What do you ask in the Prayer when you say, "hallowed be thy name?"*

Answer. I pray that God may give me strength to keep the second Commandment, in which it is written: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

59. *What is the name of God?*

Answer. He is wonderful, almighty, gracious, holy, true, merciful, wise, faithful, and powerful (Isa. 9:6; 57:15; Joel 2:13; Rev. 19:11).

60. *What is the meaning of "hallowed?"*

Answer. To hallow is to apply anything to a divine use or to turn it toward a divine use, as when one says that one should hallow one's body, that is, so far as possible you should dedicate your body to godly, good works.

61. *How is the name of God profaned?*

Answer. First, it becomes profaned in heart, in word, and in deed. In heart, when we place confidence in our own wisdom, knowledge, power, and strength.

In word, when we praise and glorify ourselves or otherwise utter evil things and swear by the name of God. In deed, when one who is a Christian lives an unchristian life. On the contrary, the name of God is hallowed in heart, in word, and in deed. In heart, when we depend upon God alone and upon no gift or creature. In word, when we ascribe to God all honor and glory. In deed, when we live a Christian life.

The Second Petition
Combined With the Third and Fourth Commandments

62. *What do you ask when you say, "thy kingdom come?"*

Answer. I ask that God may give me grace to fulfill the third and fourth Commandments.

63. *What is the third Commandment?*

Answer. "Thou shalt keep holy the Sabbath day."

64. *What is the kingdom of God?*

Answer. First, the kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, that is, faith, love, and patience in adversity (Rom. 14:17). Secondly, the kingdom of God is when Christ, at the Last Day, shall again appear to us and shall raise the dead and deliver up the kingdom to his Father, that God may be all in all, as also all creatures groan together that this kingdom may be made manifest to us and may come (I Cor. 15:23-24; Rom. 8:22).

The Third Petition
Including the Third Commandment of God

65. *What do you ask when you say, "thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven?"*

Answer. I ask again that God may give me grace to fulfill the third Commandment, which is, "Thou shalt keep holy the Sabbath day."

66. *Why do you ask twice for the same thing?*

Answer. Because this is the most important of all things, that the kingdom of God may come in us and his will be done. On this account God has also raised this Commandment to the highest place among others in the old law.

67. *What does it mean to keep holy the Sabbath day?*

Answer. First, to keep holy the Sabbath day means to perform no outward work with the hands. But this Sabbath or day of rest was established through the Gospel, and no other or more complete day of rest is proposed for us than for bodily rest and to hear the Gospel. Secondly, the Sabbath is said to be kept holy when we abstain from the handiwork of our old Adam, that is, from the sinful life of Adam, and conform ourselves to the work of the new Adam, that is, in the obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ.

68. *Why do you say, "on earth as it is in heaven?"*

Answer. Because I pray that, as all heavenly saints and angels are obedient to God, so to me also he may give grace that I may be as submissive to him as the angels in heaven and, for his sake, be submissive to elders, to duly constituted authority, and to all to whom I owe external obedience.

The Fourth Petition
Combined With the Seventh Commandment[10]

69. *What do you ask when you say, "Give us this day our daily bread?"*

Answer. I pray that God may give me grace to fulfill the seventh Commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not steal."

70. *What is forbidden to us in this Commandment?*

Answer. First, we are forbidden to be avaricious in heart. Secondly, we shall not impose by word upon anyone, insidiously to defraud him of his goods. Thirdly, from no one shall we secretly steal away his goods, or rob him by force. Fourthly, we with our possessions shall come to the assistance of all who are needy.

71. *Why then do we ask for our daily bread, that is, for temporal nourishment?*

Answer. That we may not be forced to steal on account of destitution, and that, with the temporal nourishment of God's grace bestowed upon us, we may come to the help of the poor, as also St. Paul admonishes us (Eph. 4:28). So Solomon prays: "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me: lest I be full, and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain" (Prov. 30:8-9).

72. *Do you ask also more than temporal nourishment when you say, "give us this day our daily bread?"*

Answer. Yes, I pray for the Word of God and the Gospel, which is the nourishment of the soul, for "man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live" (Deut. 8:3).

The Fifth Petition
Combined With the Fifth Commandment

73. *What do you ask when you say, "and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us?"*

Answer. I pray that God may give me grace to fulfill the fifth Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill."

74. *What is enjoined in this Commandment?*

Answer. First, that we be not envious in heart. Secondly, that we speak ill of no one. Thirdly, that we shall do no murder. Fourthly, that to everyone, even to our enemy, we shall wish and do good.

10 In the original, the Commandment referred to is designated as the sixth (*sechst gebott*). This has been assumed by some to be a typographical error. Cohrs points out, however, that this theory is untenable on the ground that the Commandment is similarly designated in the answer to Question 69. In the *Smaller Catechism* of 1528 and in the *Catechism* of 1535 Brenz follows the Augustinian division of the Commandments. The translator, in concurrence with the practice of Weisenböhler, in the foregoing quotation, has amended the text to conform to the Augustinian division.

75. *How do you come to the conclusion that you should pardon your enemy or neighbor and should not injure him with thoughts, words, or deeds?*

Answer. On this account: that I believe that God is merciful to me and has forgiven my sins through his Son Jesus Christ.

76. *How do you know that you earnestly believe this?*

Answer. When I can forgive my enemies and recompense to them good for evil. On this account we say, "as we forgive those who trespass against us."

The Sixth Petition
Combined With the Sixth, Ninth, and Tenth Commandments[11]

77. *What do you ask when you say, "And lead us not into temptation?"*

Answer. I ask grace to fulfill the sixth, ninth, and tenth Commandments, namely, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" nor covet goods nor wife.

78. *What is forbidden to you in the Commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery?"*

Answer. First, the adultery of the heart, as Christ says: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5:28). Secondly, by word, as Paul says, "Put off all these—anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication—out of your mouth," etc. (Col. 3:8). Thirdly, by deed or practice.

79. *What brings us to the transgression of the last two Commandments?*

Answer. The false pleasure and good which a man deceptively pictures to himself from his nature. For there are two kinds of pleasure and good, namely, a divine and a worldly.

80. *To what does divine pleasure have relation?*

Answer. Divine pleasure looks toward piety and rejoices in divine commands.

81. *To what does worldly pleasure have relation?*

Answer. Worldly pleasure has relation to lasciviousness and that in which the world takes delight.

82. *To what does divine good have relation?*

Answer. It looks toward the good of the soul and to the fruition of eternal life.

83. *To what does worldly good have relation?*

Answer. Worldly good has respect to pleasures, honor, and good things, which brings it about that men lose divine pleasure and good. Wherefore we pray in this petition that God may not allow us to fall into the sensual appetite of worldly pleasure or advantage, whereby we come not to eternal pleasure and good.

The Seventh Petition

84. *What do you ask when you say, "but deliver us from evil?"*

Answer. I pray that God may deliver me from the devil and all his works.

11 The original reads, *"8. 9. und 10. gebott."* For the reasons set forth in Note 10, the translator has modified the text to conform to the Augustinian division.

85. *What do you understand by the wicked or the evil?*

Answer. The devil, who is a father of all evil and of all wickedness (John 8:44).

86. *What do you mean when you say at the conclusion, "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever?"*

Answer. Thereby I confess that my Lord and God is the most bountiful, the most powerful, and the most glorious of all, and because he allows himself to be called a Father, so he will help me in all things that I have now asked. But because he also allows himself to be called almighty and all-powerful, he can help me according to my petition, and no creature may hinder or turn him aside from this will and knowledge. For this I earnestly look to my Lord and God. Amen.

Preaching in the Summertime

By Arthur O. Arnold

PREACHING IS PREACHING whenever and wherever it takes place. There is no essential difference between the preacher's task in midsummer and in midwinter. The people to whom he preaches are essentially the same throughout the year. The indifferent remain indifferent, though they may play golf in July and just sleep in January. The faithful saints brave the cold blasts of winter and endure the hot summer sun, but they come to the house of God. Neither sin nor virtue is particularly seasonal.

The Word of God is not affected by the calendar either. The Law is as accusing when our homes are heated by the summer sun as when the basement furnace does the job. The Gospel brings the same glad tidings in February and August. The message which we are commissioned to bring is the Word "in season and out of season."

However, though the audience and message remain fundamentally the same, there are a few elements in the situation which are changed during the summer season. It is the purpose of this article to consider some of these in relation to our preaching.

Physical Factors

The most obvious factor in many parts of our country is the heat of summer. The audience is hot and uncomfortable. So is the preacher. The most devoted listener discovers that his best efforts at concentration are sometimes thwarted either by his own discomfort or by the incessant motions of nearby fans—either the big whirring ones or the little cardboard ones provided by the local funeral home. We preachers might have high ideals on how attentive an audience ought to be, but we are always battling distractions, and the summer heat is a real one in many places. How should it affect our preaching? That depends.

Perhaps the wise preacher will make his sermons a little shorter in the hot summer season—not as a concession to evil but to the

frailties of the human body. Shorter sermons should not suggest a lessening of the sense of the importance of worship, but an adjustment to the realities of the situation in which the congregation worships. The wisdom of this suggestion is obvious—at least to the congregation!

More important, the wise preacher will make sure that his sermon is good competition for the distractions of summer. His material must be so interesting that his people will want to come to the service and, once there, will actually be distracted from the anoyances of the summer weather. His sermon must help the worshiper conquer the natural inclinations to drowsiness by compelling attention. The really concerned preacher will learn from his Master the wisdom of using the graphic parable, the colorful metaphor, the incisive sentence. As preachers, we cannot always presume that our audience will give us attention—or, at least, that they will continue to give it to us for twenty-five minutes. Even if they want to, they cannot always do so. The getting and maintaining of attention is our job—and we must earn the right to be heard.

The most interesting sermon a pastor can preach is one which is *vital* to his audience. Colorful material is important—but it must not be a substitute for significant content. People are always interested in that which concerns them, and it is our God-given task to make our people realize that the Gospel does concern them. Actually, the Gospel of Jesus Christ does speak to the fundamental needs, concerns, attitudes, desires, and behavior of men, and our preaching must make men realize that fact. We "forget the heat" only by becoming engrossed in something else—and our audience will be distracted from the heat only by becoming engrossed in the living, significant message which we proclaim.

Psychological Factors

The summer season not only brings seasonal heat, but in many places it also brings vacation-time and its consequences. The attendance is often smaller, the choir is not present to add to the beauty of the worship, church activities are decreased. All of this is apt to produce a let-down in attitude. The "summer slump" is not only a statistical phenomenon; it is a psychological problem as well. The difficulty is easier to describe than to cure. A couple of things should be said relative to preaching in this situation.

One is that the pastor must always remember that his responsibility is never less because his congregation is smaller. His preparation should not be less careful; his challenge is not less demanding. Some of the most treasured passages of the Gospels are those discourses which were evidently given by Christ to the few disciples. In a sense, the summer preaching situation has the same temptations for the busy pastor that the Sunday evening sermon frequently has: the consciousness that the audience will be small easily becomes perverted into the notion that the audience is therefore unimportant. What this has to say to our slavery to ego-building statistics and to our shallow conception of our pastoral responsibility is embarrassing to contemplate, but in our honest moments most of us would admit that we have succumbed more than once to this subtle temptation. Each opportunity to proclaim and interpret and apply the Word of God is a solemn responsibility, even though the audience be the two or three whom the Lord has assured of his presence.

It should also be stated that the pastor needs to watch the impression he leaves with his congregation. Some of his members are out fishing; some of his audience wish they were; but the pastor, whatever his inner longings, must not leave the impression that he would rather be out at the lake himself! One thing is certain: if our services are going to mean something to our people they must mean something to us pastors. If our people are to be inspired, we must let the Spirit of God inspire us. We might profit by being reminded of our Lord's attitude and behavior when the disciples wanted to "send them away." Let us not approach our summer preaching with any less zeal or sense of responsibility. If there must be a summer slump, let it not be in our enthusiasm or dedication to our task. "Be *urgent* in season, out of season."

Theological Factors

The coming of summer means, in churches that follow the appointed lessons of the Church year, the consideration of those texts that deal with the life of the Christian as distinct from those that deal with the life of Christ. These are texts arranged by *topics,* as opposed to *events, in* the life of our Lord. More than that, they deal with sanctification.

Some time ago the writer had occasion to listen to a considerable

amount of Lutheran preaching by pastors of various Lutheran groups. No attempt was made to listen critically, but one characteristic seemed to stand out, and the same characteristic has been observed in radio sermons, in occasional sermons, in published sermons. It is this: when we Lutheran pastors speak on the specific theme of redemption, our witness is clear and definite and evangelical, but when we preach on sanctification we are not always as clear or as definite or as evangelical. When the subject is the way of salvation, Lutheran preachers are generally of one accord in stressing that man is saved not by works of the law but by the grace of God appropriated by faith in Jesus Christ. Testimony to the atonement, though given in the variety of approaches which the Scriptures not only permit but demand, is quite consistent. The writer is convinced that when Lutheran preachers speak on the theme of redemption they bear consistent and clear witness to the great doctrine of justification by faith.

However, when these same preachers speak on the topic of sanctification, they seem to face greater difficulty. In fact, one of two things is apt to happen. Either there is a tendency to minimize the emphasis on sanctification or else there is a tendency to stress the importance of sanctification by adopting a mild form of legalism. The writer is led to believe that here is a real problem in American Lutheranism's theology. The problem is not how to state the difference between salvation and sanctification in dogmatic terms, but how to do so in practical terms. We seem to be able to distinguish between Law and Gospel in theoretical analysis, but we have difficulty in preaching faith and works in an evangelical spirit. Because the texts of the Trinity season deal largely with sanctification, we should like to consider this problem further. Various Lutheran groups do not follow identical preaching texts each year, but a few references to the "ancient Gospels" will be made. The problem is inherent in the Gospel itself (Paul and Luther had to explain it, too!) and it becomes especially apparent in our summer preaching.

Tendency to Minimize Sanctification

The tendency to under-emphasize the importance of the Christian's life expresses itself in various ways. One is by the process of *exclusion.* When a preacher is allowed freedom to select texts or topics, he simply ignores, to a large extent, the passages that deal with the fruits of the Spirit. In studying Romans, he never gets past the eighth chapter for

any serious or extended consideration. In studying the Gospels, he never really stresses the ethical content of Jesus' words. It is not that these passages are disbelieved or disputed; they are largely ignored. This is probably not generally a problem with us on Sunday mornings when we follow the pericopes, but without the guidance of the appointed lessons it can easily become a pitfall for any preacher.

The minimizing of sanctification is apt to take a different form in Lutheran pulpits. This involves an honest desire to preach "the pure Gospel," but it results in interpreting every text as if it treated justification. Works-righteousness is to be avoided, so we also avoid the preaching of works as the expression of a living faith! Let a few examples illustrate this point.

Suppose the text is from the Sermon on the Mount, as some of the summer texts are. If a Lutheran pastor begins by a general reference to the Sermon on the Mount, he is apt to feel that it is necessary to stress that the Sermon on the Mount is not the whole Gospel and that it can be misleading if its contents are divorced from the other teachings of the New Testament. This is, of course, not only valid but necessary. But what happens, at times, is that so much time and effort are spent in showing what the Sermon on the Mount is *not,* and what the *other* portions of the New Testament teach, that the preacher really does not get around to preaching on the text before him. In effect, he has by-passed the text and is actually preaching on another. This is a good example of how our doctrine of justification is apt to conflict in the practical situation with our doctrine of the Word of God. It also is evidence that the Second Article can be so handled as to minimize, if not practically eliminate, the Third Article. We must face honestly the question of whether or not we really believe that the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew are the Word of God as much as the third chapter of John or the eighth chapter of Romans. If we do believe that the Sermon on the Mount is the Word of God, then we ought to quit apologizing for it or speaking half-heartedly about it. Because some people have thrown out other portions of the Word of God is no excuse for our throwing out this portion. Either it is God's Word for his people or we have no business pretending to preach on it or pretending that we still subscribe the statement that the Bible is the Word of God.

Let us look at what is apt to happen when the text is the concluding portion of the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's account: the familiar

parable of the two men who did some house-building, one on rock and one on sand. The metaphor is obviously built on the contrast in the wisdom and foolishness of the two men who built on different foundations, one which is adequate and lasting and one which is not. Clearly, however, Jesus is saying that the wise man (like the man who built on the good foundation) is the man who, hearing his words, *does* them. The foolish man is the one who, hearing his words, *does not* do them. This is Jesus' own explanation of the parable. In other words, the message of the text is one of sanctification. But Paul also uses the metaphor of a foundation, in which the foundation *itself* is compared to Christ. He uses the same general metaphor to convey another message, the message of redemption. What easily happens is that we keep the metaphor but confuse the messages. We put Paul's application of the metaphor on Jesus' parable and end up by preaching on justification rather than sanctification without knowing what has happened! So we sing:

> My hope is built on nothing less
> Than Jesus' blood and righteousness;
> No merit of my own I claim,
> But wholly lean on Jesus' name.
> On Christ, the solid Rock, I stand,
> All other ground is sinking sand.

This is a beautiful hymn which expresses the Gospel of grace in song, but it is *not* the message of this particular text, which exhorts us not only to hear the Word but *do* it! Again, we can circumvent the Church Year by failing to deal properly with the specific appointed lessons.

Perhaps the classic example of the problem for Lutherans (and other evangelical Christians) is the familiar text of the parable of the Good Samaritan. The ease with which we let our dogmatics determine our exegesis or our application is seen in the frequency with which this parable is interpreted as an allegory in which the Good Samaritan is a type of Christ. If words mean anything at all, however, the parable is not a message about Christ's love for us but about the love which we ought to have for our fellowmen. The parable was told in answer to the question, "Who is my neighbor?" After the parable was told, Jesus asked which of the three travelers showed himself to be a neighbor, and when the lawyer replied that it was the Samaritan, Jesus said, "Go, and do thou likewise." From all of this it is clear that

Jesus was referring to the obligation to obey in spirit and deed the "second great commandment." The fact that some great Christians, including Luther, have, under the pressure of a great cause, allegorized the parable, only points up how easily the error can be made. The fact that Christ is the great example of love, and the necessity for constantly reminding ourselves that "we love because he first loved us," will in no measure change the emphasis of this text. Christ is the fulfillment of every virtue; faith always precedes Christian works; but this by no means transforms a text on our duty to love our fellowmen into a text with a different message!

These are some of the ways in which we are apt to minimize the doctrine of sanctification in our preaching. To do so violates our fundamental teaching about the Word of God. To do so causes real harm to our people, who are led away from the full message of the Word which we are called to divide rightfully, not to decimate. To do so destroys the real quality of our doctrine of justification, for if faith does not result in love, if justification does not result in sanctification, if the new birth does not produce the new life in Christ, if he who has begun a good work in us is not permitted to bring it to completion, then there is something wrong—not just with one of the fruits but with the tree itself!

This is not intended to question the centrality of the message of the grace of God and of our obligation to preach "no other gospel," but it is intended to point out that we must preach the whole Gospel. Even the framework of the Church Year, with its appointed lessons, is no guarantee of balanced preaching unless we go beyond playing with metaphors and preach the message which the Word of God in all of its richness has to offer.

Tendency to Become Legalistic

An alternative tendency to that which minimizes the Christian life is that which places great stress on its importance but in the process loses sight of the evangelical character of sanctification. This tendency has reappeared throughout the history of the church and was one of Paul's great problems. Again, it is not so difficult to deal with it theoretically or dogmatically, but in the practical situation the temptation toward legalism is great. Perhaps this temptation shows itself most in that area of the application of the Gospel which calls for support of the program of the church.

Let us look at our preaching on stewardship. The writer claims to have no scientific analysis of a large segment of preaching on this subject. What follows is an impression—supported by some observation, analyzed in his own temptations and experiences. It is frequently said that we must not think of stewardship as involving only money, which is decidedly true. But it must also be said that we must not think of Christian stewardship as being motivated by the law. Nor must we as pastors imply that a sufficient contribution to the right cause will enable anyone to be saved by anything but the grace of God—even if the gift is large and the cause is our favorite one, whether that favorite is a new parish house or foreign missions! If the local pastor is in danger of using a little legalism to balance the local church budget, the administrator in the work of the church-at-large is in equal danger of making the support of the missionary program of the church the one meritorious work for Lutherans.

The confusion rests at the point where we think of preaching stewardship as a means of supporting a program instead of as a means of developing Christians! Jesus preached much about money—not to get it for himself or even for his cause, but to get it off the throne in the lives of his listeners. He did not want their money, but he wanted their faith and love and allegiance! The modern American preacher, with all the pressures of the present-day ministry upon him, is often driven almost to the point of losing his Gospel in order to get his people to meet quotas. The people should give of their money and their talents and time willingly and gladly, motivated by the Spirit of God, but time will not permit waiting for the Spirit of God, so "a little pressure"—a threat of judgment, a promise of God's blessing, the assurance of a reward, in short, a little Law instead of Gospel—is used to do the trick!

The same temptation is present in every area of the Christian's life. We are tempted not to trust our young people, so we make laws as to what they can and cannot do—and wonder why the young people do not become strong, mature Christians. It seems that the Lord himself has to convert us into believing that he can do as good a work in the life of another as he has done in us. Somehow we easily believe that *we* can live in the freedom of the Gospel, but *others* need the fences we build for them to keep them from going astray! This simply means that we do not believe in the Spirit of God; we believe in ourselves, as nervous, doting parents who never realize that their job is not to live

their children's lives for them but to help them become the kind of Christian persons who can live their own lives triumphantly. This is a real temptation for pastors, who never *quite* believe in the priesthood of all believers, who have not *quite* rejected the Roman conception of the ministry, who do not *quite* feel it safe to let God be God! So when we come to preaching on sanctification the temptation is to "lay down the law"—not necessarily in vehemence, but in reality nonetheless.

The Solution

The solution to the above dilemma is the same one which Jesus espoused when he said, "Either make the tree good and the fruit good, or else the tree corrupt and the fruit corrupt." It is the same solution that Paul reached when he stressed, in that fighting epistle to the Galatians, that we are saved, not by works of the Law, but by faith created by the Spirit of God—the same Spirit who brings forth fruits of patience, love, meekness, kindness, and all the rest. It is the same solution that Luther found when he so definitely emphasized that faith —real faith—produces love and good works. It is the same solution that we shall discover in our Catechism's explanation to the Third Article if we do not stop after giving God the credit in the first couple of lines but go on and give God the control of our lives so that his Spirit can not only call us, but also enlighten, sanctify, and preserve us!

In other words, we must see that sanctification is not something that is tacked on to the Christian faith but that it is an outgrowth of it, as the fruit is an outgrowth from the tree. Sanctification is implied in our redemption. Justification is implied in our Christian life. If there is no sanctification, there is something wrong with our understanding of justification, as there is something wrong with the tree if there is no fruit! The attributes of the new life in Christ are not something to be handled carelessly; they are *the will of God for his children!* Also, they are not to be realized by our works—as if we take over after God has given us a good start. They are the results of *God's working in us now,* as he did when he first called us!

Preaching sanctification from this evangelical point of view can never become dull, even during the summer season! When the message which a pastor brings to his people is that God is coming to them through his Word to redeem and transform their lives, even the summer heat is weak competition! "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, . . . preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season. . . ."

Notes and Studies

THE USE OF *ALMAH* IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By Albert E. Myers

MUCH CONTROVERSY has centered upon the Hebrew word *almah,* especially in Isaiah 7:14. The exact determination of its meaning has been the problem. The meanings proposed by opposed parties in the controversy are "virgin" (as translated in the Authorized or King James Version of the Old Testament) and "young woman" (as translated in the more recent renditions, notably the Revised Standard Version of 1952).

The root of the word *almah* is found in the three radicals *aleph, lamedh,* and *mem.* Brown, Driver, and Briggs, in their standard lexicon (*A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,* Oxford, 1952), assert that the probable original meaning of these radicals is "to be mature sexually." Comparative philology and Hebrew etymology present the same conclusion.

However, the etymology of a word is not conclusive in determining its meaning. Usage is also of much importance. Let us turn our attention to this facet of the problem.

We shall first look at the passage upon which most of the dispute lodges, Isaiah 7:14. This passage has been variously translated. On the one hand, we have etymological evidences which would determine the meaning as "young woman." A sexually mature female would be one possible referent. But the Jewish translators of the Septuagint (LXX) translated *almah* as here identical with *parthénos,* "virgin." Let us examine this translation before proceeding further.

It is entirely possible that the LXX did not have in mind a female who had not had sexual intercourse when they used the Greek word *parthénos.* Liddell and Scott have asserted that *parthénos* is used at least four times in classical Greek to refer to a female who was *not* a virgin! This may be another example of such usage. Further light is brought to the problem by an examination of the Song of Solomon 6:8. Here *almah* appears in distinction to two other classes of women comprising the royal court (?). Wives and mistresses are mentioned, and in addition, a group of women referred to with the plural of *almah.* Surely, then, since the previously mentioned classes included all who would *not* have been virgin, we should expect the LXX to use *parthénoi* for this third class, presumably maidens (cf. RSV) *if parthénos* meant "virgin" for them. Thus it turns out to be likely that *parthénos* did not mean "virgin" or "maiden." The authority of the translations (also ancient and authoritative) of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion is also against the construction of *almah* in Isaiah 7:14 as "virgin"; they all used the word for "young women," *neanis.* The King James Version used

the word "virgin," perhaps basing this upon a faulty exegesis of the LXX or the Hebrew text. It might also be recalled to mind that "virgin" in the days of the translators of this version (1611) did not necessarily mean a female who had not had sexual intercourse. Thus much evidence points toward the conclusion that *almah* was never translated in this passage as meaning a "maiden." Those who assert that this word must now be rendered "virgin" can base their arguments upon neither philosophy, etymology, nor usage.

There are, of course, other arguments in favor of the rejection of the translation of "virgin" for *almah* in Isaiah 7:14. C. A. Beckwith, in his article, "The Virgin Birth-Relation to Isaiah 7:14" (*The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* Vol. XII, p. 206), points out that the emphasis of the prophet was not upon the virginity or upon a miraculous birth. John Aberly ("The Book of Isaiah," *Old Testament Commentary,* edited by Alleman and Flack, p. 651) affirms that the reference is to an event near at hand. Such a translation would be against all Jewish usage. Beckwith writes, "Moreover, in the whole scope of Jewish literature outside of the Scriptures, whether apocryphal or apocalyptic, there is no trace of an exposition of this passage as signifying 'virgin,' or of an expectation that a Messiah was to be miraculously conceived." And he continues, "Jews contemporary with Justin, Tertullian, and Jerome interpreted *almah* in Isaiah 7:14 as a young woman." Surely if a virgin were the referent, less ambiguous language would have been employed. Aberly and others assert that the prophecy of Isaiah 7:14 is fulfilled in Ahaz, to whom Isaiah was addressing this section (cf. Isa. 8:3).

It is interesting to note that Bruce Vawter, C.M., of Kenrick Seminary (St. Louis, Missouri) has found a parallel passage in Ugaritic ("The Ugaritic Use of GLMT," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Oct. 1952, p. 319 f.). The sister-word of *almah* is used. Here it is translated, in context: "Behold, the *girl* bears (has born) (will bear) a son. . . ." Obviously this girl is married (context). The word referring to her is the Ugaritic word closely related to *almah.* This piece of evidence further substantiates the RSV translation.

There has been some speculation upon a relationship between *almah* and the verb *alam.* The verb *alam* means "to conceal," and the supposedly related *almah* must mean "one who is concealed" (i.e., from the eyes of men)—a virgin. This argument is not based upon sound etymology (cf. any good lexicon) but has been advanced by several scholars.

Many who argue against the translation of *almah* as "young woman" base their contentions upon other usages of the word in the Old Testament itself. Despite the rather conclusive arguments advanced (*supra*) in favor of "young woman" as opposed to "virgin," we must not fail to include the testimony of parallel usage in Scripture. Let us turn briefly to other usages.

In the so-called "Jahwist" document the word is used in Genesis 24:43. In this context the rendition as "young woman" is definitely correct—the referent is the maiden, Rebekah. The translation "maiden" or "virgin" would also be correct, however (so Moffatt and others). Rebekah was definitely a virgin. Again,

in the "Elohist" document *almah* is used of a girl who was undoubtedly a virgin, Moses' sister (Ex. 2:8). The translation of *almah* in Proverbs 30:19 should also be "young woman"—virginity granted from the context. The RSV translation is "the way of a man with a *maiden,*" and this is surely correct from the context. Both passages in the Song of Solomon (1:3 and 6:8) containing the word also show it to mean "maiden"—and again this is determined from the context (cf. discussion of 6:8 above). Note that the context alone gives a narrower meaning to the term *almah,* which could also be translated as "young woman" in every passage of the Old Testament.

In order to be absolutely certain as to the meaning of *almah,* we must ask the question, What, then, is the word for "virgin" in biblical Hebrew? If a less ambiguous word is available, we may safely affirm that *almah* does not mean "virgin" but merely denotes a young woman. The lexicon tells us that there is a Hebrew word specifically meaning "virgin." It is the feminine noun *b'thulah.* This clear meaning is to be adduced from fifty passages of the Old Testament containing the word. The word is to be compared with Arabic and Assyrian sister-words. The Assyrian *batultu* is from the same root (also *batulu,* "young man"). This comparative philology shows that the meaning is "virgin" although the Assyrian is not so definite—in the masculine the Assyrian has no reference to the lack of sexual experience on the part of the youth.

The usage of *b'thulah* leaves one in doubt in two passages only. One of these controverted passages is Genesis 24:16. According to one critic, ". . . where Eliezer tells of seeing Rebekah, he speaks of her as a *b'thulah* and adds, 'whom no man had known.' If *b'thulah* meant 'virgin,' the further explanation would not have been required." It is easy to see the weakness in this argument. The Hebrew of Genesis 24 is, as is much of the Old Testament, a reduction to paper of the traditions of the people. These traditions must have been lyrically preserved in oral transmission. In such a state, as is common in all lyrical styles the world over, emphasis by repetition of thoughts is common. The phrase "whom no man had known" was certainly not intended to be an explanation of *b'thulah,* but must be viewed as a poetical repetition, strengthening the testimony of virtue that is here given about the maiden who is to be Isaac's wife. The critic's comment that ". . . in verse 43 of the same chapter Eliezer speaks of her as an *almah,* a young woman of marriageable age but not married," carries no weight in the argument. The verses immediately preceding and following this one show us (cf. the Hebrew text) that Rebekah would not necessarily have been the referent, although it turns out that she was the "young woman" who was to be found at the well.

A second argument based upon the usage of *b'thulah* is based upon Joel 1:8. Several scholars have found this word to have an ambiguous usage here. Brown, Driver, and Briggs list this use of Joel as one falling under the head, "one living apart in her father's house as *a virgin.*" The Hebrew seems clear enough. The verse reads: "Lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the bridegroom of her youth." Edgar E. Snyder ("The Book of Joel," *Old Testament Commentary,* edited by Alleman and Flack, p. 808 f.) and others are also of this opinion, that

Joel is referring to ". . . the sorrow of a virgin for her betrothed." This is by far the most reasonable conclusion.

We therefore must add the testimony of usage to that of comparative philology and etymology. *B'thulah* is quite definitely the Hebrew word for "virgin."

In conclusion, we find that: (1) Comparative philology and etymology prove that *almah* is to be rendered "young woman." (2) Usage, biblical and otherwise, determines the validity of this translation. (3) Rational considerations in favor of this translation are strong. (4) A comparison with *b'thulah* shows that this word, not *almah,* is the Hebrew word for "virgin." These considerations prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the RSV translation of Isaiah 7:14 is correct. All evidence points to the fact that the female in this passage was merely a young woman. There is no reference to her sexual experience, or lack of it, although she must have been sexually mature. We conclude that the attack upon the translation of *almah* in Isaiah 7:14 in the RSV is unjust.

ST. PAUL'S USE OF IRONY

By John Reumann

AMONG THE literary qualities in the writings of St. Paul is a tendency toward the use of irony, whereby "the meaning intended is contrary to that seemingly expressed."[1] These ironic statements involve a degree of incongruity between what is said and what is actually the case, and convey under- or overtones beyond the plain sense of the words.

It was natural for Paul to include irony among his rhetorical equipment, first of all, because the Grecian environment of his life and work made it quite familiar. *Eirōneia* was a Greek term. The Attic drama had reveled in it. Historians like Thucydides wrote with one eye on the quality. Socrates was irony personified. And if, by the time of Paul, literature did not still abound with such brilliant examples, irony was nonetheless known and appreciated.[2]

Secondly, Paul's Jewish heritage acquainted him with irony. The trait was not solely Greek, for the Semitic peoples employed it too. The Old Testament contains numerous examples. Narratives like Genesis 38 and the Joseph story play

1 *Webster's New International Dictionary* (2nd edition).

2 On Greek backgrounds of irony, cf. especially J. A. K. Thomson, *Irony: an Historical Introduction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927); G. G. Sedgewick, *Of Irony, Especially in Drama* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1935); A. R. Thompson, *The Dry Mock: a Study of Irony in the Drama* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948); and Eirik Vandrik, *The Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1943), pp. 79-83. It is perhaps significant that Kierkegaard, so saturated with irony at times, wrote his master's thesis on the subject, *Ueber den Begriff der Ironie mit ständiger Rücksicht auf Socrates* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900).

up inherent dramatic irony. Prophets often waxed ironical.[3] Even the Lord was portrayed as speaking with a bitter irony when he told the idolatrous Israelites, "Go and cry unto the gods which ye have chosen; let them deliver you" (Judg. 10:14; cf. Jer. 2:28)!

In the third place, Pauline irony stemmed from the character of the Gospel itself. That the Son of God "took upon him the form of a servant" (Phil. 2:7) and died a criminal's death certainly involved incongruity. The notion that the long-awaited Messiah should associate himself chiefly with obscure fisher-folk and publicans was a monstrous irony of history. Moreover, many sayings attributed to Jesus made use of irony[4]—consider especially the use of *hypsoō*, "to lift up," in John 12:32 f.—so from the start the trait seems characteristic of the Gospel.

Often Paul's irony takes quite routine forms. One of the most common examples is litotes, the use of a term contrary to the meaning desired, together with a negative to invert the expression; it is ironical in that it understates the case and implies more than it seems to say. At II Thessalonians 3:7-8, for example, the apostle writes, "For we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's bread for nought." This is another way of saying, "We acted properly and paid for what we got." Several times the phrase occurs (Rom. 1:13, 11:25; I Thess. 4:13), "I would not that ye should be ignorant." This is really a more polite way of saying, "I want you to know." At Philippians 3:1, "to write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous," means simply, "it is a pleasure to write them."[5]

Akin to this is Paul's use of a siugle word, ironically, to take on a meaning other than its orthodox or usual one. To cite two examples: "One of themselves, even a 'prophet' of their own, said, 'The Cretans are always liars'" (Titus 1:12),

3 For example: "The fortress also shall cease from Ephraim,
And the kingdom from Damascus and the remnant from Syria.
They shall be as the 'glory' of the children of
Israel, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Isa. 17:3).
"Behold thou [Tyre] art wiser than Daniel;
There is no secret they can hide from thee" (Ez. 28:3)!
"Come to Bethel—and transgress!
At Gilgal—multiply transgression" (Amos 4:4, 5)!

For discussions of irony in the Bible, cf. especially Solomon Glass, *Philologia Sacra* (Leipzig: J. F. Gleditschium, 1705); Thomas Delaune and Benjamin Keach, *Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors* (London, 1682; republished, London: W. H. Collingridge, 1856); and Eduard König, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Litteratur komparativisch dargestellt* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900).

4 For example: Matt. 23:32, "Fill up then the measure of your fathers."
John 7:28, "Ye both know me and ye know whence I am."

With the use of "raise up" in John 12:32 f., cf. the use of the Hebrew verb *ns'* at Gen. 40:19.

5 It may be significant that eleven of the twelve examples of litotes I have observed in the book of Acts are connected with Paul— either he is speaking or is a principal actor in the verse involved. The references are 14:28, 15:2, 19:11 (AV "special miracles," RSV "extraordinary miracles," but cf. Greek), 19:23, 24, 20:12, 21:39, 26:19, 27:14, 20, 28:2. The other, non-Pauline, example occurs at 1:5.

and ". . . whose 'god' is their belly" (Phil. 3:19). A writer today might convey the fact that he is using the term "prophet" and "god" in an unusual way by placing them in quotation marks.

Sometimes an entire clause seems to reflect ironic understatement. Consider the comment Paul makes at I Thessalonians 2:15 about the Jews who slew Jesus and were persecuting Paul himself: "They please not God." The same holds true for that tongue-in-cheek aside he adds after asking the Thessalonians to pray for him because of all the wicked people in the world (II Thess. 3:2): "for all men have not faith."

The most developed forms of Pauline irony seem to occur in the correspondence with Corinth and Galatia. It is not hard to see why. Whatever the details may have been concerning the origins of these letters, it is apparent that they were written in a Grecian environment to a people not unfamiliar with irony. Moreover, in writing parts of them Paul was certainly in a frame of mind that readily lent itself to ironical expression. Galatians and portions of Corinthians abound with invective and sarcastic questionings, and such feelings often lead to the use of irony.

In these letters litotes again occurs. The phrase, "I would not have you to be ignorant," crops up at least twice in I Corinthians (10:1; 12:1; cf. II Cor. 2:11). The anaphoral formula at I Corinthians 1:26, "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble," is another way of saying "few wise, mighty, or noble men." When Paul is too diplomatic to tell the Corinthians, "I find fault with you," he writes instead (I Cor. 11:17, 22), "I praise you not." An interesting example in a similar vein occurs at II Corinthians 9:1, where Paul begins, "For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you." Then the rest of the chapter is devoted to a very necessary lesson on stewardship!

Paul's use of such ironical understatement to introduce delicate subjects is scarcely accidental. He was probably aware that litotes always has the advantage of a certain "time-lag" between hearing and comprehension. Rebuke is present, but in a less obvious, offensive way.

There are also examples of ironic use of words or short asides in these letters. At Galatians 1:6, 7a Paul says, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another 'gospel' which is not another." And in II Corinthians 4:4 we read, "The 'god' of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not." Such passages (cf. also II Cor. 11:4, 13) employ the words "gospel" and "god" in a sense other than their usual one. The RSV has caught this flavor when it puts the terms "gods" and "lords" in quotation marks at I Corinthians 8:5, "For although there be many so-called gods in heaven or on earth—as indeed there are many 'gods' and 'lords'—yet for us there is one God."

Ironical in its understatement is an aside like that at Galatians 5:23, where, after listing the fruits of the Spirit, Paul adds, "Against such there is no law." There is also the little comment at I Corinthians 7:40. Paul has been discussing marriage problems, not by "commandment of the Lord," but after his own judg-

PAC[illegible]
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

ment—yet he gives authority to the opinions by concluding, "And I think also that I have the spirit of God."

More extended use of irony occurs when Paul resorts to allegory, which finds in a story some hidden meaning that exceeds, and sometimes contradicts, the literal sense. The device of allegory is ironic in that the speaker talks about one set of facts but means something else.

By this method St. Paul makes Abraham's two sons stand for the two covenants, of Law and Gospel (Gal. 4:21 ff.), and gives the exodus a spiritual meaning that somehow relates to the Christian sacraments (I Cor. 10:1 ff.). This does not imply that Paul questions the historicity of the Abraham story or of the exodus, but he does make new interpretations far beyond their literal sense. Of course, it may be argued that Paul is here simply following the exegetical principals of contemporary Judaism or that he is paralleling Greek efforts at allegorizing, as Heraclitus had done with the *Iliad*. But the point is that Paul did use allegory, and the device is ironic to the core because the meaning intended by Paul is contrary to that seemingly expressed by the original narrative.

In addition to litotes, ironic use of words and phrases, and allegory, Paul indulges in an irony of character in his letters. He assumes a pose that overrates others, underestimates himself, and even views his message ironically.

Examples of Paul's ironic portrayal of others come readily to mind. At Galatians 2:6 he speaks of the leaders in Jerusalem as those "who seemed to be somewhat." Nowadays we might be tempted to call them "men who think that they are 'it' "; certainly such is the meaning of the phrase *dokei einai ti* at 6:3, "If a man thinks he is a 'somebody,' when he is a 'nobody,' he deceives himself." Later Galatians 2:9 describes James, Cephas, and John as the men "who seemed to be 'pillars' of the church." Twice in II Corinthians (11:5, 12:11) Paul protests —and note the use of litotes again—"I was not a whit behind the 'very chiefest apostles' " (*hoi hyperlian apostoloi*). In each case he is defending his apostleship against derogatory comparison with other men, and the phrases applied to them seem a bit ironical.

Some of the terms Paul applies to the congregation at Corinth also seem to have a ring of irony to them. He writes (II Cor. 12:2 f.), "I have espoused you to one man, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I am afraid lest perchance . . . your minds may be seduced. . . ." From what we know about morality in the Corinthian church, the use of such phrases as "chaste virgin" (*parthenon hagnēn*) and "lest perchance you may be seduced" (*mē-pōs . . . phtharēi*) sounds ironical, especially in what has often been identified as part of the "severe letter."

Along with this ironic praise of other men, there is a parallel tendency for Paul to abase himself; he poses as a fool, much like Socrates had done, or Geoffrey Chaucer on the way to Canterbury, who feignedly remarked after Harry Bailly's ridicule of his wretched Tale of Thopas, "That is the beste rym I kan!"[6]

6 *Canterbury Tales,* B 2118.

Of course, for Paul it is all a pose; lest he be misunderstood, he writes (II Cor. 11:26), "Once more let me advise you not to look on me as a fool."[7] But he goes on, "Yet if you do, then listen to what this 'fool' has to boast about." The Corinthians, he knows, will appreciate such foolish boasting, "for ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise" (II Cor. 11:19). In another comparison between Paul the Fool and the "splendid" Corinthian agitators he writes: "We dare not make ourselves of the number or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves" (II Cor. 10:12). And again: "Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us—and I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you" (I Cor. 4:8). Small wonder that Jerome said even of I Corinthians, "written in gall, not ink."[8]

Ironically, one of the ways Paul professes to have wronged the Corinthians was in not taking any pay from them: "Perhaps I made a mistake in cheapening myself (though I did it to help you) by preaching the Gospel without a fee" (II Cor. 11:7, Phillips). "What makes you so inferior to the other churches? Is it because I have not allowed you to support me financially? My humblest apologies for this great wrong" (II Cor. 12:13)! Such ironical portrayal Paul even extends to the Gospel he proclaims, in the comparison between human smartness and the wisdom of God at I Corinthians 1:17-2:16. At the outset he states the real antithesis: "The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto us which are saved it is the power of God" (1:18). But as he goes on, he refers to the message of the cross—ironically—with the term used by the world: "It pleased God by the 'foolishness' of preaching to save them that believe" (1:21). "The 'foolishness' of God is wiser than men; and the 'weakness' of God is stronger than men" (1:25). Indeed, God's whole method of dealing with the world might be called ironical, for "[he] hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise" (1:27 f.).

Under all this dissembling and irony, what was Paul's real aim? A few verses from II Corinthians 12 and 13, where the ironic attitude appears most fully, suggest an answer: to edify. "I have made a fool of myself in this 'boasting' business, but you have forced me to it. . . . Our ambition for you is true Christian maturity. Hence the tone [one is tempted to add, 'the ironic tone'] of this letter" (12:11, 13:10, Phillips). Paul desired to edify, using irony as a teaching device.

Commentators as far back as Theodore of Mopsuestia[9] noted a resemblance between Galatians and parts of Corinthians. Lightfoot wrote, with reference to Galatians and II Corinthians, "the similarity consists not so much in words and

7 The translation is from J. B. Phillips, *Letters to Young Churches* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1948). This paraphrase of the Pauline epistles is one of the best renderings in English to show the writer's ironic tone.

8 Cited in T. R. Glover, *The Mind of St. Paul* (London: Humphrey Milford, 1941), p. 14. Interestingly, Westcott and Hort punctuate the clauses in I Cor. 4:8 with question marks, another way of taking the passage, but again an indication that the lines are not meant literally but ironically.

9 *Spicil. Solesm.*, I, p. 50.

arguments as in tone and feeling."[10] Perhaps part of that tone and feeling comes from the irony that is present in these letters.

LUTHERANS IN THE GREAT ECONOMIC DEPRESSION[1]

THE CRASH OF THE Wall Street stock market in October, 1929, marked the beginning of an economic depression which quickly engulfed the whole world and lasted almost ten years. There are complicated theories concerning the origin of the depression, but it appears that the major cause was the delayed effect of economic dislocations brought about by World War I. In the United States, where 13,000,000 people were soon unemployed and where the national income was cut in half, the depression had a tremendous effect on church life. Only a small beginning has been made to describe and evaluate what the depression meant to American Christianity,[2] and the following is intended as a contribution in the direction of that larger study which still needs to be made. It concerns itself only with the Lutheran Church in America, and especially with the Lutheran Church east of the Mississippi.[3]

There was a fairly widespread notion in the early stages of the depression that the loss of material possessions would drive men to reliance on God and that a great religious revival would ensue, for it was recalled that earlier periods of economic distress in American history (1854-1859, 1873-1879, 1893-1897) had brought about or were accompanied by spiritual awakenings.[4] This hope was soon blasted. Not only was there no evidence of a general deepening of spiritual life, but statistics revealed that the rate of the church's growth was retarded.[5] A decline in the

10 *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* 2nd edition, revised (London: Macmillan and Company, 1866), p. 44.

1 Summary report of an investigation made in an historical seminar conducted by Theodore G. Tappert in the Graduate School of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia during the academic year 1954-55.

2 Samuel C. Kincheloe, *Research Memorandum on Religion in the Depression* (New York, 1937), prepared before the depression had run its course, discusses possible techniques in study more than it offers conclusions.

3 For purposes of comparison, studies were made of samplings in other denominations. In what follows, footnote references are made only to the most illuminating or to the actually quoted sources since the accumulated evidence is far too extensive for citation here.

4 *The Lutheran* (Philadelphia), Oct. 6, 1932, p. 3; Nov. 24, 1932, p. 6; *The Lutheran Companion* (Rock Island, Ill.), Sept. 29, 1934, pp. 1222-1224, and Oct. 6, 1934, pp. 1255-1257.

5 In the United Lutheran Church from 11.3% in the years 1925-30 to 8.1% in the years 1930-35. The Pittsburgh Synod reported that accessions in 1930 were lower by 1,027 than in 1929 (*Minutes,* 1931, p. 99). Cf. *Minutes,* United Synod of New York, 1936, p. 188; *Kirchenblatt* (Columbus, Ohio), Feb. 28, 1931, pp. 10, 11.

birth rate was followed by a natural decline in accessions by baptism.[6] Even more significant were complaints of declining church attendance, and it became necessary for ministers to emphasize that people ought not to absent themselves from public worship because they were poorly dressed or because they could no longer afford to give their customary offerings.[7] Economic hardship accelerated migration, and it was surmised that the movement of population also affected church membership. "That accessions by transfers were fewer this year than last," it was suggested as late as 1939, "probably indicates that the economic situation in 1938 was more uncertain than in 1937. . . . Ability to respond to appeals for money are not so welcome in bad years as in good ones, and some folk who have moved from one address to another stay away from church and from membership because it seems to spare them from a kind of social humiliation."[8] Instead of a religious revival, it was in fact feared that a "spiritual depression" would follow in the wake of the economic depression.[9]

It was occasionally asserted that faith in God would protect church members from the evil effects of the depression which non-church members were experiencing. The Christian faith produces industry and sobriety, it was argued, and those who possess such qualities will not be unemployed and impoverished. The Christian faith was looked upon as a kind of insurance against unemployment. "We believe," a prominent layman declared, "that our Lutheran constituency is less influenced by the economic depression than almost any other group."[10] It quickly became evident, however, that even Lutherans could not "wholly escape the limitations of unemployment and bad business," as the same writer put it. The belief that men of true faith would invariably prosper turned out to be illusory, and it should not have required the peculiar hardships which attended the great depression to make churchmen aware of this.[11] "Why must the poor," it was soon asked, "and all those on the fringe of society feel, as they usually do, that their poverty excludes them from membership in our churches? . . . Can it be that we neglect to evangelize the poor because they constitute no financial asset and may even become a financial liability? . . . Our present economic upheavals have toppled many so-called 'respectable' folks from their former places in society. . . . The church dare not lose interest in them when they begin to slip down the economic scale."[12]

That Lutherans could not "wholly escape the limitations of unemployment and bad business" was clearly reflected in the financial records of the church.

6 The birth rate declined from 22.5 per thousand of population in 1925 to 16.7 per thousand in 1936. There was a parallel decrease in the number of baptisms, followed later by a drop in Sunday school enrollments. Cf. *The Lutheran,* Oct. 11, 1939, pp. 10, 11.

7 *The Lutheran,* Apr. 28, 1932, p. 23; Jan. 19, 1933, p. 13; Feb. 9, 1933, p. 17.

8 *The Lutheran,* Apr. 26, 1939, p. 15.

9 *Minutes,* Nova Scotia Synod, 1933, p. 5.

10 *The Lutheran Standard* (Columbus, Ohio), Apr. 18, 1931, p. 2: *The Lutheran,* Jan. 29, 1931, p. 2.

11 *The Lutheran,* Jan. 8, 1931, p. 22.

12 *The Lutheran Standard,* Jan. 19, 1935, p. 16.

While there was undoubtedly some truth in the observation that "fear of hard times rather than heavy financial losses . . . accounts for a tightening of purse strings when the collection plate appears,"[13] actual economic distress played a part in reduced giving. One pastor reported early in the depression that out of 96 families in his congregation there were 40, by actual count, whose means of support had been cut off.[14] This was an unusual case, but quite as untypical were the rural congregations in some parts of Pennsylvania whose records give no outward evidence of their having been affected by the depression.[15] With very few exceptions congregations everywhere felt the pinch of hard times. Uncounted thousands of Lutherans were made to suffer poverty and want,[16] and fear and uncertainty heightened the effect of the suffering. Businessmen in churches were reported to "see red," church councilmen were nervous as they faced their duties, and clergymen were restless.[17] A mood of pessimism "occupied the pews and, in some cases, the pulpits in our churches and, in too many cases, dictated the policies of the Kingdom, so that there is manifest today in the church at large the same paralyzing hesitancy, cloying fear, and unsettling restlessness that characterizes large areas of the business world. We are afraid! We are uncertain! We are unsettled!"[18] As a result of distress and fear the financial receipts of congregations gradually declined, and this reduction was quickly passed on to synods and church bodies. Per capita contributions in one synod dropped from $25.47 in 1929 to $11.82 in 1934. By the beginning of World War II, when prosperity had returned to the territory, the per capita contributions still amounted to only $14.27.[19] The drop was greater than can be accounted for by monetary deflation alone, and it took a long time for people to relearn the art of giving once it had been lost.[20] Benevolence contributions sent to the United Lutheran Church fell from $1,422,919 in 1930 to $866,538 in 1933 and climbed back only to $987,017 at the beginning of World War II.[21] Reduced income was often accompanied by mounting indebtedness; the indebtedness of the Missouri Synod increased $522,128 during the year 1932 alone.[22] The closing of banks caused additional financial embarrassment in many areas.

The words of the president of the North Carolina Synod were repeated in one form or another throughout the length and breadth of the church: "On ac-

13 *Minutes,* Nova Scotia Synod, 1930, p. 7.

14 *The Lutheran Standard,* Jan. 17, 1931, p. 7.

15 Many rural areas of Pennsylvania appear not to have been so adversely affected as rural areas in the Middle West. On mortgage foreclosures see *Lutherischer Herold* (Philadelphia), Jan. 26, 1933, p. 9.

16 *The Lutheran,* Jan. 28, 1932, pp. 8, 9. At the same time vast sums were spent on luxuries by the American people; cf. *Kirchenblatt,* Apr. 4, 1931, p. 11.

17 *The Lutheran,* June 11, 1931, p. 9.

18 *Minutes,* Ohio Synod, 1931, p. 21.

19 *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1929-40, passim.

20 *The Lutheran Standard,* Jan. 16, 1937, p. 16.

21 *The Lutheran,* Aug. 30, 1939, p. 2; *Minutes,* United Lutheran Church, 1938.

22 *The Lutheran Witness* (St. Louis, Mo.), Oct. 11, 1932, p. 352.

count of business depressions which have come over the country, our congregations, our synodical institutions, and the synod itself have all found it difficult to meet obligations as they came due."[23]

One of the first things that congregations did in the face of shrinking income was to economize by cutting "luxury items" out of their budgets. Sunday schools ceased giving attendance awards and distributing free ice cream at picnics. Ushers stopped wearing flowers in their buttonholes. Printed bulletins and newspaper advertising were discontinued.[24] The number of soloists was reduced, their season was shortened, or the employment of soloists was altogether abandoned.[25] Auxiliary meetings were sometimes held on Mondays so as to take advantage of the heat remaining in church buildings from Sundays and thus conserve fuel.[26] More drastic was the action of a congregation which had the water shut off in the church and had the toilets bolted in order to eliminate the water bill.[27]

Another inevitable step was to reduce salaries. Organists, choir directors, sextons, and other employees had their salaries slashed, and in at least one case an organist was asked to return his whole salary as an additional contribution to the support of the church. Sometimes at their own suggestion and sometimes not, parish clergymen also had their salaries cut. There were exceptional cases in which salaries were not formally reduced, but the same effect was achieved by having the pastor contribute more to the church treasury in order that his full salary might be paid.[28] It sometimes happened that congregational treasurers did not have sufficient funds to pay the pastors' reduced salaries on time,[29] and when overdue amounts piled up, they were seldom paid in full.[30] One congregation bought a new organ the year the pastor's salary was reduced, and had the church exterior repainted another year when the treasurer reported insufficient funds to pay the pastor's salary.[31] As a rule, however, repainting and the purchase of new equipment were postponed. In one synod 87 of the 120 clergymen on the roll were reported to have salary reductions between 1933 and 1936.[32] In another synod, in which 93 out of a total of 217 clergymen were reported to have sustained similar reductions, mention was made of "the tremendous burdens being borne uncomplainingly by a large number of pastors. Testing times have found them to be pure stuff, sincere, courageous, and faithful in spite of personal sufferings. . . . However, statistics do not reveal the whole truth concerning reductions; actual reduc-

23 *Minutes,* North Carolina Synod, 1931, p. 14.

24 Based on orally reported recollections of laymen in various congregations.

25 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, St. John's Church, Easton, Pa., 1931, 1932, 1935.

26 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, Trinity Church, Topton, Pa., Feb., 1933.

27 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, St. John's Church, Williamstown, N. J., 1932.

28 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, St. James' Church, Phillipsburg, N. J., 1930-39; *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1932, p. 205.

29 MS. Treasurer's Record, New Bethel-Zion Church, Grimsville, Pa., 1937.

30 *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1931, p. 37; *The Lutheran,* Feb. 25, 1932, p. 9.

31 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, New Bethel-Zion Church, Grimsville, Pa., Oct. 22, 1933, and Mar. 10, 1937.

32 *Minutes,* East Pennsylvania Synod, 1936, p. 27.

tions by way of cancellation of back salaries and monthly rebates and gifts would raise the average cut to a scandalous figure. Even reduced salaries are not being paid regularly, some pastors reporting no salaries received from January 1, 1933, to April 1, 1933."[33] Meanwhile the work of parish clergymen was vastly increased as they were called upon to minister to larger numbers of people who were despondent, desperate, and in want.[34] Of course, salaries of officers of synods and church bodies and of board secretaries and employees were also reduced.[35]

There was some unemployment among clergymen as well as among other people. Because of the uncertain economic conditions, older clergymen did not retire as soon as they normally might have. On this account as well as on account of the failure, for want of funds, to establish new congregations, there were few vacant parishes. Consequently there were seldom openings for unemployed clergymen, and meanwhile more students were being graduated from theological seminaries than could be employed.[36] In one synod there were only three vacancies in 1934 while there were sixteen ordained clergymen and fourteen graduates of a theological seminary who were unemployed and ready to serve.[37] The larger Missouri Synod had 177 available men in 1932 and only 29 places for them.[38] It was proposed to "make jobs for the jobless" by persuading wealthy individuals or congregations to provide recent graduates of seminaries with board and lodging and send them out into new fields to start missions.[39] Some became assistant pastors, but there was little money to start new missions.

It was reported that in 1931 mission boards were required to make "radical adjustments," in 1932 "drastic reductions," and in 1933 "appalling curtailments."[40] Even the reduced salaries of home missionaries sometimes went unpaid, and distress among them was said to be so acute that they were sometimes unable to purchase food for their children.[41] Meanwhile the salaries paid to foreign missionaries in India were only 41% of the stipulated amounts of the average.[42] A sharp reduction in the mission program at home and abroad resulted.[43]

Similar was the effect of the depression on educational institutions. Reduced

33 *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1933, p. 180.

34 *The Lutheran,* Apr. 21, 1932, p. 15.

35 In the American Lutheran Church (*Minutes,* 1934, p. 12) missionaries, teachers, and church officials contributed $146,620.84 to the treasury in 1933 by reduction in their salaries. *Minutes,* Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1934, p. 57; *The Lutheran,* May 18, 1933, p. 5.

36 *Minutes,* Augustana Synod, 1932, pp. 16, 17; United Synod of New York, 1933, p. 39; 1938, p. 40; Pittsburgh Synod, 1932, p. 43. On the decline in the planting of new churches within the United Lutheran Church see *The Lutheran,* Feb. 17, 1954, pp. 24-29, where a graph is reproduced.

37 *Minutes,* Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1934, p. 59.

38 *The Lutheran Witness,* June 21, 1932, pp. 223, 224.

39 *The Lutheran,* Mar. 5, 1931, p. 5.

40 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 2, 1933, p. 27.

41 *The Lutheran,* May 4, 1933, p. 3; July 13, 1933, p. 2.

42 *The Lutheran,* May 23, 1935, p. 6.

43 *The Lutheran Witness,* May 9, 1933, p. 165; *The Lutheran Companion,* Jan. 13, 1934, p. 37; Mar. 3, 1934, pp. 265, 266.

income compelled church colleges to borrow money, make special appeals, and cut corners.[44] Lack of funds on the part of students and their parents caused enrollments to drop and introduced further difficulties.[45] Thiel College, in Greenville, Pa., reduced salaries of faculty personnel by as much as 40% in an attempt to keep going.[46] Decreased income and enrollment were also experienced in theological seminaries.[47] The theological seminary connected with Susquehanna University in Selinsgrove, Pa., was closed in 1934 because the need for it was no longer apparent and on account of "present conditions with reference to supply and placement of ministers and the need for conserving our means."[48] Dr. J. C. Kunzmann made a valiant attempt to raise money in the East to keep the Pacific Seminary in Seattle, Wash., going,[49] but this school also had to close its doors in 1933. Hartwick Seminary, nominally the oldest Lutheran theological seminary in America, moved from Cooperstown, N. Y., to New York City in 1930 but succeeded neither in demonstrating that it had a mission nor in raising the necessary funds to continue,[50] and so, after a precarious existence during the years of the depression, it shut down in 1940.[51] Similar (1934) was the fate of the equally small Martin Luther Seminary in Lincoln, Neb.[52] Other schools of theology were compelled to reduce their services, cut faculty salaries, beg and borrow money, and accumulate deficits.[53]

Institutions of mercy experienced like pressures. Hospitals and homes for children and the aged received more applications for admission than ever before. This was on account of the depression, and for the same reason their income decreased at the same time.[54] Staff salaries were reduced and work loads increased to make maximum services possible. Especially heavy demands were made of inner mission societies and welfare agencies. It was to these that people turned for help in largest numbers, and the needy who sought assistance were Lutherans as well as non-Lutherans. The Pittsburgh Inner Mission Society, supported by

44 *The Lutheran Companion,* Jan. 27, 1934, p. 112.

45 *Minutes,* Maryland Synod, 1931, p. 97; South Carolina Synod, 1933, p. 26; Ohio Synod, 1931, p. 58; New York Synod, 1935, p. 98, and 1938, p. 192; Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1939, p. 166.

46 *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1932, p. 103; 1933, p. 100; 1939, pp. 152, 153.

47 *The Lutheran,* July 12, 1939, p. 8.

48 *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1933, p. 112.

49 *The Lutheran,* Jan. 28, 1932, p. 22.

50 *Minutes,* United Synod of New York, 1938, p. 178.

51 H. H. Heins, *Throughout All the Years: the Bicentennial Story of Hartwick* (Oneonta, N. Y., 1946), pp. 102, 105, 107.

52 *Lutherischer Herold,* July 6, 1933, pp. 11, 12; *Minutes,* United Lutheran Church, 1936, p. 203.

53 M. R. Weng, *Passavant's Vision: a History of the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary* (Maywood, 1951), pp. 58-64. *Minutes,* Synod of West Pennsylvania, 1932, p. 68; Susquehanna Synod, 1934, p. 83; South Carolina Synod, 1933, p. 47; 1934, pp. 50-53; 1935, p. 17; 1938, pp. 97-99; Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1937, p. 161; 1938, p. 149; 1939, p. 152.

54 *Minutes,* Maryland Synod, 1938, pp. 49, 50; Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1938, p. 232; Pittsburgh Synod, 1931, p. 156; 1932, p. 169.

150 congregations of various Lutheran bodies in Greater Pittsburgh, carried 500 families on its relief list by the beginning of 1932, and by the end of the same year the number of families had risen to 1,068. During the following year the society served 36,109 meals to the needy and provided lodging for 10,952 homeless persons.[55] Similar expansion of services in the face of critical need was reported by other societies and agencies.[56]

All arms of the church were utilized to offer some assistance in meeting the immediate problem of unemployment. Inner mission societies introduced employment bureaus or "employment secretaries" to help secure work for the jobless.[57] Cooperation with secular agencies was cultivated in this as in other areas. The small Inner Mission Society of Reading, Pa., succeeded in securing positions for 188 of the 261 persons who applied to it for work during one year.[58] St. Paul's Church in Evanston, Ill., established a parish employment service for the twofold purpose of securing at least occasional work for the unemployed and of supplying workers where there was need for them,[59] and other congregations did the same.[60] Unemployed parishioners were hired by congregations as sextons or were given other forms of part-time employment.[61] The importance of having parishioners bear one another's burdens and do all that was possible to spread employment was constantly reiterated.[62] At best, however, only token help could be given by the church. Despite all the efforts that were made, it was realized that more far-reaching measures were necessary, and some clergymen advocated introduction by the state of unemployment insurance, a heavier program of public works, and a shorter work-week to spread available work.[63]

Those for whom adequate employment could not be found were helped in other ways. It was discovered by the local inner mission society that 60% of the children who were taken out of the congested tenement areas of New York City for a short stay in a summer camp were suffering from anemia and undernourishment, and 94% of these were from Lutheran Sunday schools.[64] Food was obviously needed. In Auburn, Neb., a meal was prepared daily by church people for the benefit of poor school children, and this arrangement, begun by Lutherans, soon received the hearty support of local Presbyterians and Methodists.[65] A soup kitchen, established by the Walther League in New York City,

55 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 23, 1933, p. 26; *The Lutheran Companion,* Feb. 17, 1934, p. 220.
56 E.g., *Minutes,* Maryland Synod, 1930, p. 87; 1931, p. 92; 1932, pp. 75, 76, 82.
57 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 5, 1931, p. 25; Nov. 19, 1931, p. 13.
58 *The Lutheran,* June 25, 1936, p. 15.
59 *The Lutheran,* Jan. 7, 1932, p. 28.
60 *The Lutheran,* Jan. 4, 1934, p. 11.
61 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, Trinity Church, Camden, N. J., Dec. 11, 1934; information secured through interviews concerning congregations in the state of New York.
62 *Minutes,* North Carolina Synod, 1931, p. 24; Maryland Synod, 1933, p. 75; Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1930, p. 49.
63 *The Lutheran,* Jan. 22, 1931, p. 14.
64 *The Lutheran Companion,* Jan. 27, 1934, pp. 110, 111.
65 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 18, 1932, p. 27.

fed between 300 and 400 jobless men every Sunday, and in addition about 300 meal tickets for use in a restaurant were distributed every Sunday.[66] In many congregations welfare committees were appointed to see to it that needed food would reach poor families.[67] Food was regularly collected for this purpose among those who were able and willing to contribute. In one case five bushels of potatoes were sent to a family, in another case a ham, in still other cases milk or baskets of groceries.[68] Women were encouraged to can more vegetables and fruits than they needed for themselves in order that they might have something to give to others who were in greater need.[69] About 75% of the congregations in one synod which responded to a questionnaire were conducting relief programs of this kind in 1931.[70]

In addition to food, gifts of clothing, coal, wood, and medicine were made to the needy. Toys and dolls were repaired and given to the children of poor families especially during the Christmas season.[71] Destitute children were provided with dresses and other clothes when they were approaching confirmation.[72] Both synodical and congregational funds were set up and were variously used to make loans in emergencies or to make outright gifts to pay rents, etc.[73] Directly and indirectly, meanwhile, Lutherans contributed to community welfare agencies of various kinds.[74] Beggars and peddlers were helped with discrimination.[75] "Never before in the history of the church," it was asserted, "has the Christian life been graced with so many beautiful forms of charity as it has during these depression days. . . . The unselfishness of Christians stands out as a bright beacon light in the gloom of the present economic depression."[76] Extravagant though these words may appear to be, it must be remembered that the material assistance rendered by Christians, individually and corporately, actually was greater than records of the time can reveal. Moreover, it cannot be computed statistically to what an extent the experiences of the church during the depression prepared for the larger giving toward relief, rehabilitation, and inter-church aid, especially through Lutheran World Action, during and after World War II.

One of the unhappier consequences of the depression was that some people who were made desperate by their destitution or their fear of destitution resorted to violence and crime to secure a better living. Sullen bitterness and illegal practices were on the increase in American society,[77] and here and there dubious

66 *The Lutheran Standard,* Jan. 10, 1931, p. 10.
67 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 11, 1932, p. 23.
68 Based on oral reports.
69 *The Lutheran,* July 21, 1932, p. 15.
70 *Minutes,* Pittsburgh Synod, 1931, p. 174; Ohio Synod, 1931, p. 75.
71 *The Lutheran Standard,* Jan. 10, 1931, p. 10; *Lutherischer Herold,* Oct. 20, 1932, p. 12.
72 MS. Minutes of Ladies' Aid Society, Trinity Church, Camden, N. J., Mar. 14, 1939.
73 MS. Minutes of the Church Council, St. John's Church, Easton, Pa., Aug. 1939; *Minutes,* United Synod of New York, 1938, p. 39; *The Lutheran,* Jan. 4, 1934, pp. 9-11.
74 E.g., MS. Minutes of the Church Council, St. James' Church, Phillipsburg, N. J., 1931-36.
75 *The Lutheran Witness,* Nov. 6, 1934, pp. 385, 386; *Lutherischer Herold,* Mar. 9, 1933, p. 9.
76 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 9, 1933, p. 11.
77 *Lutherischer Herold,* Jan. 26, 1933, p. 9; *Minutes,* Augustana Synod, 1934, pp. 12, 13.

practices invaded the churches themselves. Not only did church members raise money for their congregation by selling commercial products in competition with salesmen and shopkeepers,[78] but contributions designated for benevolence were occasionally diverted to the operating expenses of congregations. Congregational treasurers had to be reminded that, if generally practiced, this selfish procedure would have a crippling effect on the missionary, educational, and merciful work of the church. "To withhold funds that are desperately needed is bad enough, but that anyone in the church would divert designated funds from the purpose for which they were given is almost unbelievable because it is a deliberate violation of a most sacred trust. The violation of morals is having a terrible effect upon the morale of the church in this hour of extreme challenge."[79]

Considerable thought was given to the peculiar function of the church in the economic depression. It was believed to be the function of the state, not of the church, to adopt the measures necessary to end the depression, and it was estimated that 98% of the help given to those in need came from public welfare.[80] The danger in this, it was asserted, was that the masses of people would look increasingly to the government for help and guidance.[81] Not only would they become irresponsible and lose their self-respect, but they would become an easy prey for subversive economic theories and systems.[82] A few clergymen as well as laymen were convinced that the depression exposed the bankruptcy of the capitalistic system and they looked to the church "to take a hand in an economic reform." The editor of one church paper, who seems in this instance to have represented the majority opinion in the church, cautioned against "the sweeping conclusion that the present economic system is fit only for the scrap-heap." The trouble is not so much with "our industrial regulations" as with "the folk they are supposed to regulate. . . . No plan of economic oversight can quickly rise above the wisdom of its personnel, except such a one as calls for the installation of some form of dictatorship."[83] The tendency in some circles to convert the Gospel into a blueprint for the reform of human institutions was sternly resisted.[84] The business of the church, it was said, is to change people by the preaching of the Word of God, to take the "die" out of the "depression" and "press on,"[85] to advocate and live faith, confidence, love, sympathy, consolation, encouragement, and hope.[86] It is not without significance, however, that when clergymen assembled for formal or informal meetings, more and more attention was given to a discussion of topics

78 *The Lutheran Companion,* Jan. 13, 1934, pp. 48, 49.
79 *The Lutheran,* June 15, 1933, p. 2.
80 *The Lutheran Standard,* Feb. 19, 1938, p. 3.
81 *The Lutheran Standard,* Nov. 19, 1938, p. 1; Dec. 3, 1938, p. 1.
82 *The Lutheran,* Feb. 23, 1938, p. 21.
83 *The Lutheran,* June 11, 1931, p. 15.
84 *The Lutheran Witness,* Jan. 26, 1937, pp. 385, 386.
85 *The Lutheran,* July 21, 1932, p. 8.
86 *The Lutheran Standard,* Sept. 19, 1931, p. 4; Dec. 26, 1931, p. 3; *The Lutheran,* Oct. 15, 1931, p. 14.

which had to do with the church and the social order.[87] The need for a Christian ethic which has relevance to the problems of modern society was increasingly felt even if the ethic was itself not yet forthcoming.

WINDISH LUTHERANS AT HOME AND ABROAD

By Ernest A. Stiegler

FORTY YEARS AGO the writer became the pastor of the Windish Lutheran Church in Bethlehem, Pa., a congregation made up of Christians who came to America as immigrants a few years earlier. The homeland from which they came was in southwestern Hungary. In addition to their native Windish tongue, many of them could speak Hungarian and understand German. Being descendants of God-fearing ancestors, they joined St. Peter's Lutheran Church in Bethlehem, where services were then conducted in German as well as English. Their faithful church attendance created something of a sensation in that large congregation, for Sunday after Sunday the good Windish people came to the German service so early that by the time the original members of St. Peter's arrived, many of them could not be seated.

Accordingly the pastor and church council of St. Peter's Church decided that something had to be done. In cooperation with the church authorities St. John's Windish Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bethlehem was organized in the fall of 1909. A young American pastor volunteered to learn the Windish language, and after struggling for four years he gave up his noble effort, admitting his inability to learn a language for which there was neither a grammar nor a dictionary to aid him in his effort.

During these four years the Windish members built a small basement church. They became somewhat discouraged by the fact that they could not obtain a pastor who could preach the Word of God to them in their native tongue. They wrote numerous letters to their bishop in Hungary, praying him to send them a pastor who could speak the Windish language. In response to their fervent pleas Bishop Alexander Raffay, of Budapest, Hungary, arrived in January, 1914, to counsel with the Windish members in Bethlehem. Deeply impressed by their faith, he informed them that there was a serious shortage of Windish-speaking pastors in their native land. However, he stated that he knew of a pastor who had served as personal chaplain to the presiding bishop of Hungary prior to his coming to America. He was at the time serving the Hungarian congregation in New Brunswick, N. J. Bishop Raffay was of the opinion that this pastor would be able to learn to preach in the Windish language in a short time.

87 *The Lutheran Standard,* Feb. 9, 1935, p. 7. In 1939 a statement on the duty of the church in social relations was prepared by the National Lutheran Council. For other statements see Osborne Hauge, *Lutherans Working Together: a History of the National Lutheran Council* (New York, 1945), pp. 66, 67.

Some of the more skeptical members of the congregation, remembering their experience with their first pastor, objected to the election of a stranger. But Bishop Raffay replied to the objectors by saying that he would wager his right arm that the young pastor he recommended would be able to preach in Windish within a year after his election. So it was that the writer was unanimously elected in April, 1914, to become the pastor of St. John's Windish Evangelical Lutheran Church in Bethlehem, Pa., and was installed on July 4, 1914. On the train coming from New Brunswick, N. J., to his new mission field, he memorized the Lord's Prayer in Windish. Arriving at the railroad station in Bethlehem, he was somewhat disturbed by the fact that not a single soul was there to greet him. A parishioner who accompanied him on his trip from the old to the new congregation joyfully remarked, "Pastor Stiegler, it seems that you are not wanted here; let us return to good old New Brunswick."

Ten minutes passed in thoughtful silence at the forsaken platform of the railroad station when all at once the music of a band was heard. The sound became clearer and stronger by the minute, and presently more than a thousand people filled the railroad station. A group of about a hundred young girls surrounded the new pastor, and their leader, a charming young girl with a bouquet of flowers in her hand, began to recite her carefully studied welcoming speech. In her excitement she was unable to complete it, and so she handed the flowers to the young pastor. But in a moment she took the bouquet back from him to finish her words of welcome. Then the newly elected young pastor was placed in a carriage. Quickly the big crowd organized itself in parade formation and, led by the band in a joyful Fourth of July spirit, paraded through the streets of Bethlehem, finally arriving at the little basement chapel, where some of the celebrities of the church waited in patience to install the pastor in his new parish. From the very first hour of his arrival he remembered that he was responsible for the right arm of the bishop of Budapest. He turned night into day to learn the Windish language and to build the congregation. When traveling in Europe and visiting the homeland of the Windish people in 1927, he preached in some of their ancient churches to the amazement of native Windish pastors.

Within two years of his arrival in Bethlehem a beautiful church was built, and since that time two parish houses were erected and a number of other properties purchased. These are now evaluated at more than $346,000 and they are free and clear of all indebtedness. Within the past forty years the membership grew to 1,500. All church members are loyal American citizens, and nearly all of them own their own homes. In the second generation of the congregation there are no fewer than seventy-two college graduates, and among them are pastors, teachers, physicians, dentists, lawyers, physicists, engineers (chemical, civil, electrical, mechanical, aeronautical), a commercial artist, accountants, music teachers, secretaries, nurses, a number of active and reserve officers in all branches of the military services, and about fifty prospering businessmen in various enterprises.

A few incidents will illustrate how little the American public knows about the Windish race, or the Wends, who live here. Some years ago the writer con-

sulted the Secretary of Labor in Washington, D. C., in the interest of a Windish immigrant and discovered to his amazement that on the official list of all nationalities living within the boundaries of the United States there was no trace at all of the Windish people. Somewhat similar was the experience of a young man of the parish, now a graduate of Lehigh University, during World War II. While serving in the army he was called out with a number of other rookies by his sergeant. The sergeant asked all the young men questions with reference to their national origin. In answer to the question put to him our boy answered, "Windish." The sergeant asked him a second time and became very indignant when he heard the young man repeat, "I am Windish." Believing that the rookie was trying to make fun of him, the sergeant commanded him to stand at attention for six hours in the blazing sun. After six hours, believing that the young man had learned his lesson, the sergeant asked him the same question again and received the same answer. At last, at the expense of the young rookie, the sergeant learned that there was such a people as the Windish living in America.

Centuries ago the name "Windish" was given to the Wends by the Germans as a nickname. "Windish" or "Wendish" is an adjective derived from the noun "Wend." The Wends were the first of the Slavs to appear on the stage of western Europe. Nearly a thousand years before the Slavs migrated to Europe these people were known and referred to as Wends by such Roman writers as Pliny and Tacitus and by the Alexandrian historian Ptolemy. About the year A.D. 79 Pliny reported that among the people living on the other side of the Vistula River were, in addition to the Sarmatians and others, the Wends (Latin: *Venedi*). Tacitus recorded an identical statement. He described the Wends in more detail but could not make up his mind whether he ought to include them among the Germans or the Sarmatians; still they seemed to him more closely connected with the Germans. Ptolemy called the Wends the greatest race on the Wendic Gulf, now known as the Baltic Gulf. However, he asserted later that they lived on the Vistula River. From this description we may conclude that the Wends lived for centuries before the birth of Christ around the Baltic Gulf on the River Vistula. Ptolemy also spoke of the Venedic mountains. Both of these writers were in doubt about the origin of the Wends, but Pliny and Tacitus believed them to be closer to the Germans than to the Sarmatians. But both of them must have been misled by the outward appearance and facial expressions of the Wends, which until this day differ from those of any other Slavic people.

According to ancient Greek history the Greeks obtained amber from the Wends four centuries before the birth of Christ. The Wends lived at the river Eridanos, in the country of Enetoi, from which it may be concluded that the Wends were already living on the shores of the Baltic Gulf in the fourth century before Christ.

The name "Wend" was given to them by other people. In their own language they do not call themselves "Wends" but speak of themselves as *Slovenci* and *Slovenje*. How, then, did they receive the name "Wend"? There are different interpretations. Some have tried to derive the word "Wend" from Teutonic dialects,

as the Danish *wand* and the old Norwegian *vatn,* like the Latin *unda,* meaning water. Thus, "Wends" would signify watermen, people living by the water, by the sea. A derivation from the German *wenden* (to turn) has also been suggested; thus the Wends are the people wandering about. It has also been suggested that the name comes from the Gothic *vinja,* related to the German *weiden,* pasture, people who pasture, or shepherds. The most reasonable interpretation, I believe, is to trace the name "Wend" to the Celtic expression *vindos,* which means "white" or "pale face," by which the dark-complected Celts designated the newcomers in contrast to themselves as the pale-faced people.

The Roman historian Jordanis, who lived about the middle of the sixth century, divided the Slavs into three groups, Veneti, Slavs, and Antae, which would correspond to the present division of western, southern, and eastern Slavs. He designated the Wends as the western Slavs.

By the beginning of the seventh century historians no longer name the Slovenic people "Wends" but call them Slavs. Historians of the seventh century speak of the southern and western Slavs, who belonged to the kingdom of a Prince Samo, simply as Slavs, but mention the fact that Prince Samo, their ruler, came from the tribe of Slavs known as *Vindi,* the Wends.

The migration of the Wends must have started from their original European home around the Baltic Gulf before the birth of Christ. There was a period of time after the birth of Christ when the Wends occupied central Europe from northern Italy to the Baltic Gulf. The original inhabitants of the province of Venice were Wends. In northern Italy there is also a region called "Veneto" whose inhabitants are descendants of the Wends. In the lower Tyrol, in Austria, some of the names of mountains, such as Venetberg and Venediger, remind us of earlier times when their inhabitants used to be Wends. The beautiful Bodensee in Switzerland was also known to the ancient Romans as *Lucas Venetus.* In the German state of Bavaria the names of such towns and cities as Winidum, Winidova, Windten, Windenberg, Windfurt, and Windeck likewise suggest the old glory of the Wends. Their migration from their original home must have been sporadic, and their last move must have occurred when they were driven westward by stronger tribes in the early centuries after Christ.

After they had lost their national unity, the Wends became subjects of stronger nations. In their royal titles the kings of Sweden and Denmark still carry the distinction of being kings of the Wends. There are two groups of Wends in Europe today. One is in Lusatia, a district that is now behind the iron curtain in eastern Germany, between the Elbe and the Oder Rivers, lying north of Bohemia on the upper course of the Spree in Saxony and Prussian Silesia. Their number is about 150,000. They are often called Lusatian Sorbs by the Germans. For more than fifteen centuries the second group occupied a small mountain terrain above the Muhr (Mura) River at the intersection of three countries, Austria, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Today they number fewer than 100,000. There is no question that the Wends in Germany and Hungary are the only survivors of this great and ancient race, the Wends.

In the Roman Empire the district which the second group of Wends inhabited was part of the province known as Pannonia. In this territory the Wends survived all the other tribes and nations, including the Celts, who were the main inhabitants of Pannonia in the early centuries after Christ. The history of the Wends proves that they never made overtures to any of the Slavic nations or to the other southern Slavs, such as the Slovenes, the Croatians, and the Serbs, but after their country was occupied by the Magyars at the end of the ninth century, the Wends lived in close and friendly contact with the Magyars for nearly 1,000 years. After World War I, in accordance with the treaty of Trianon, the land of the Wends became part of Yugoslavia.

It is the contention of the writer that the Wends are the mother race of all the Slavs. The reason for this conviction is that, although the Wends settled in western Europe one thousand years before the arrival of the other Slavic nations and tribes, basic words and roots of words of all the Slavic tongues are to be found in their language. It is also interesting to note that all the Slavic people, such as the Russians, Ruthenians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Serbians, Bulgarians, Croatians, and Slovenians, claim to be Slavs, but they have great difficulty in understanding one another.

The homeland of the second group of Wends is a small mountain district, a very poor agricultural land. This is probably the reason for their racial survival. Their land was so poor that no one else wanted it. The topography of the land is very picturesque, with towering mountains covered with pine forests. From a high elevation it is possible to see the whole land, the many little villages, the orderly, well kept, always white-washed homes, and the little farms. Every inch of tillable land is under cultivation. The average farms are three to six acres, and in most cases a farm must provide a livelihood for three generations living on it. The Wends love the soil and know how to make the most of it. But such little farms could never provide adequately for their livelihood since their standard of living was always higher than that of their neighbors. For this reason some members of a family had to emigrate to provide for the essentials of life. For centuries they were wanderers over the face of the earth. During certain months of the year they worked in the industrial centers of Austria, in the big cities of Central Europe, and as harvesters on the estates of rich Hungarian landlords. When they accumulated sufficient funds, they flocked back to the old homestead to spend a few pleasant winter months around the old fireplace. Often they went to their places of employment in groups. Their leader was the contractor who arranged work for them. As a rule their home-coming was also in groups. Such homecomings were always celebrated with wine, song, and dance, and during the winter months stories were told about their adventures in foreign lands. Because the Wends traveled over the world for centuries, many of their original traditions and customs were lost. Returning sons and daughters brought clothes for their beloved ones at home from foreign countries, and gradually traditional national garments disappeared from their life.

Among the old Windish traditions which are still in existence I should like

to mention a ritual used in the engagement of young lovers and also before the performance of the marriage ceremony. The best man, accompanied by the friends and relatives of the groom, was admitted to the house of the bride-to-be only after he had satisfied the attendants of the bride who were waiting for him at the gate of the bride's home. Lengthy responsive conversations took place between the groom's best man and the attendants of the bride. The talk between them included questions and answers about the groom's habits, his piety, and his conception of marriage. At the engagement party, which was usually held three or four months before the marriage, certain gifts were given to the bride as tokens of the engagement pledge, and these were such things as two loaves of bread, a pint of wine, a dish of flour, salt, a lamb, and a rooster. A similar ritual was repeated on the day of the wedding.

Another tradition of the Wends is the nightly wake at a house of mourning. When death occurs, neighbors, friends, and relatives remain awake in the house of the deceased, singing and chanting funeral songs all night long. The Wends like to sing at work, too, and their songs are very beautiful, somewhat melancholy in tone.

The neighborliness of the Wends is exemplified by another very old tradition. In case of a fire, all the neighbors got together to rebuild the home of their unfortunate neighbor. Some furnished the timber and others the labor, and so in a short time the man who had suffered loss by fire could move into his newly erected home.

Religion is deeply rooted in their hearts. About sixty per cent of the Wends are Roman Catholic and forty per cent of them are Lutheran. Some of their old Catholic churches originate from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and old religious pictures of those centuries are still preserved on their walls. These pictures were the handiwork of a famous Windish painter, Joannes Aquilla, who lived at that time.

The Reformation found early followers among the Wends. Some of the traveling Wends brought the news of the Reformation to their homeland within a few years of the beginning of the Reformation. Although the New Testament was not translated into the Windish language until 1771 by the Rev. Stephen Kuzmics, so many of the Wends knew German and Hungarian well that they were able to interpret the Word of God to their fellow Christians in their own tongue. After the Reformation the consolation of the Scriptures helped them to survive centuries of hardship and sufferings, for their homeland was often the scene of bloody warfare. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries invading Turkish hordes repeatedly burned and robbed their villages. Driven out of their homes, the Wends found refuge in the forest until the Turks left, when they had to rebuild their villages, churches, and home. Under the influence of the Counter-Reformation the Lutheran Wends also suffered persecution at the hands of Roman Catholics. Their churches were taken away from them and they were forbidden to worship God in accordance with their faith, but throughout the years of religious persecution, the Protestant Wends remained faithful to their church.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century religious freedom was established in Hungary, and from that time on the Windish Lutherans built a number of new churches and now have nine flourishing Lutheran parishes abroad and twice as many Roman Catholic churches. Each Lutheran congregation was composed of the people from five to eight villages. A church was always built in a centrally located town, and the people of surrounding villages had to walk, sometimes for an hour or more, to attend services. In spite of such difficulty the great majority of Wends did not miss a Sunday service.

The Wends are thrifty, industrious, and religious people. Their women work hard at home and in the fields, and they often perform the labors of men. The first Windish immigrants came to America at the very beginning of this century. Most of them came between the years 1907 and 1914. Although there are some smaller Windish settlements in the United States, the largest of them is in Bethlehem, Pa., the great steel center, where about 4,000 souls of Windish origin live today.

COMMUNITY IN THE LITURGY

By Francis E. Reinberger

THE IDEA OF community is basic for an understanding of the Judaeo-Christian tradition of worship and life. Familiar to all is the indebtedness of Christian liturgy to its Jewish antecedents. From the Old Testament and the synagogue came many ideas and forms which have always occupied an important place in the Christian cultus. We need only mention such elements as the reading of Scripture lessons, the exposition of Scripture in the sermon, confession, the singing of psalms, various types of prayers (including the Amen), and the use of the Decalogue to demonstrate the extent to which the early church borrowed from its Jewish heritage. In passing it must not be overlooked, however, that the church added to its Jewish heritage an orientation which was new and different.

The element in Jewish worship which is of greatest interest to us just now is the strong ethical tone which pervaded it. This was the burden of priest as well as of prophet, and both concerned themselves with the problem, though by different means. The Canaanitish nature festivals had to be adapted to fit the revealed character of Yahweh and the unique nature of the Jewish community. It was this Old Testament emphasis on the element of community that found ready acceptance by the primitive Christian church. H. Wheeler Robinson, writing on the psalmists, stated: "Religion, like morality, is always socially conditioned—or should we rather say that both religion and morality are social products to which there is individual reaction?"[1] In the thinking of the pious Jew, the community was never far away. He was always conscious that he was an Israelite, thus a member of a community, and his God was the God of Israel.

1 H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Social Life of the Psalmists," in *The Psalmists*, 67.

The note of community marked to no less a degree the worship of the early Christian church. From the beginning the church's corporate worship consisted of Word and sacrament. In style, the "office of the Word" was modeled to a large extent after that of the synagogue. The "office of the Lord's Supper" on the other hand was unique in the Christian fellowship. The idea of community can best be seen, perhaps, in two prayers which early found their way into the Christian liturgy of the sacrament. The first is the brief but highly significant eucharistic prayer known as *Maranatha,* "Come, Lord Jesus," set forth in the concluding chapter of John's Apocalypse (22:20). Cullmann is right when he declares, "The prayer is fulfilled already in the community's celebrations of the Lord's Supper."[2] The second was a fixed part of the liturgy at the writing of the *Didache:* "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy Kingdom" (9:4).

It is interesting to note that Professor Cullmann sees the element of community to be the means by which St. Paul could achieve a "harmonious combination of freedom and restriction." He states: "Paul was able to bring freedom of the Spirit and the restrictions of liturgy together in the self-same service because he saw everything in the light of the one aim: the *oikodome* (building up of the church). Here lies the greatness and uniqueness of the early Christian service of worship. With the high aim of the 'building up' of the community . . . Paul does not fall into the error of reducing the worship life of the church to a minimum from fear of the binding character of liturgy, nor yet does he, out of fear of sectarianism, fall into the error of eliminating on principle from the service of worship all free expressions of the Spirit."[3] We cannot help but wish that this harmony could have been maintained throughout the history of the church, for surely the disappearance of this harmony was one of the causes leading to the breakdown of the ecumenism of the early church.

A study of the primitive liturgies, beginning with that of Serapion in Egypt, the basic representative type for the eastern churches, and that of Hippolytus, basic to the analyses of succeeding western liturgies, leads to the conclusion that the note of community was of primary concern for the post-apostolic church. The Pauline ideal, "to be in Christ," is sometimes interpreted in terms of mystical individualism. Nothing could be further from the truth. Such an interpretation has come about, surely, under the aegis of modern individualism. To be sure, the apostle considered the state of being "in Christ" a great personal privilege, but this perforce caused man to consider ever more earnestly his role in the community, the Body of Christ.

One final note may be given to demonstrate the importance of the note of community in the worship life of the early church: the strong position of the doctrine of the Body in the thinking of St. Paul and the other apostles. Believers

2 Oscar Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship,* 16.
3 *Ibid.,* 32 f.

in Christ were incorporated into the community of his Body, the church, and it is by his Body in the Sacrament of the Altar that the community is upheld and maintained. Professor Jeremias has insisted that the words, "This is my body, . . . my blood," mean that Jesus is transmitting to believers in him the real essence of his life and personality until he shall come. Thus, as the community of Christ feeds on his Body and Blood, it becomes the actual life and personality of the risen Christ. How else may we interpret Paul's words in I Corinthians 10:16 f.: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation [an act of community] in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation [an act of community] in the body of Christ?"[4]

Thus it can be seen that in the first three centuries of the church's history the principle of communion-fellowship was a factor of major importance in the molding of Christian worship and life. Following the death of Constantine (A.D. 337), however, a marked change set in. For one thing, the act of communion in the Mass fell into disuse. In the liturgy those elements which set forth the note of fellowship were dropped out, as witness the shrinking of the communion-psalm. At the same time, the theory of sacrifice in the Mass, with its strong note of individualism, came to the fore. One who examines the developed Roman liturgy of the Mass, as in use today, will discover that slight notice is given to the element of communion-fellowship. Even among the greatest saints of the medieval church this note was missing. Bishop Brilioth has pointed out that "Thomas á Kempis represents perhaps the sacramental piety of the Middle Ages at its very best; but it is to be noted that while he gives us many beautiful sayings about the union of the individual Christian with the Lord, we find in him scarcely a trace of the thought which was so central to the view of the primitive church, the union of the faithful with one another through communion."[5]

In this period an increasing number of liturgical devices was introduced which, purposely or not, had the effect of steadily removing the spirit of community from the understanding of the church. The withdrawal of the chalice from the laity, the performance of the mystery of the Mass by the priest behind the drawn curtain of the rood-screen, the growing unintelligibility of the Latin language, the increased practice of private Masses in side chapels—these and many others fostered the heightened view of the individualized, otherworldly nature of the Christian message in the Mass.

Even the arts of this period reflected the loss of interest in the note of community. The early Byzantine artist stressed in his painting of the Last Supper the communal sacramental act centered in Christ's distribution of the elements of bread and wine. Leonardo da Vinci, on the other hand, fired by the Renaissance spirit of individualism, in the same event was frankly interested in the psychological question, "Is it I?"

4 J. Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu,* 103; cf. J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body, A Study in Pauline Theology,* 57.

5 Y. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic,* 81.

It is in Luther that we find once again the emphasis on communion-fellowship. The Reformer's brief, epigrammatical declaration, "Prayer is a social act,"[6] expresses his understanding. For Luther the church's corporate worship was above all else the incorporation of believers into the community of saints, with the result that "suffering and sin are shared in common, and so love is kindled from love. In the sacrament God gives us help against sin, as though he were to say: See here, sin of various sorts troubles you; take then this sign by which I declare to you that this sin troubles not only you but challenges my Son Christ and all his saints in heaven and earth. So, be comforted and trust; you do not fight alone; strong help and support are around you."[7]

It is perhaps strange that the Roman Church should have departed so far from the thought of Augustine, for whom the note of community in worship and life was a strong reality. Luther never forgot this emphasis of his spiritual father. How unfortunate, then, that the Reformer's contemporaries did not grasp the singular importance of this principle as strongly as did he! And it is equally unfortunate that Luther himself was diverted from the more intensive development of this theme in worship by the pressure of other problems requiring his attention. After 1520 he became so involved with Rome over the corruption of the Mass, and later with Zwingli over the question of rationalism, that the principle of community assumed a secondary role in his writing and preaching. Not that his mind was changed in this matter—far from it—but other things became uppermost with him.

Perhaps if Luther had not been distracted from the development of this theme, succeeding ages would not have regarded it so lightly. At any rate the intellectual and spiritual movements of the centuries which followed were by nature little interested in social implications, whether in worship or in any other phase of existence. The individualistic Renaissance was followed by the rationalistic Enlightenment, and this was followed by great interest in personal devotion. In the Roman Church there was extraordinary interest in mysticism; in Protestantism the age of Pietism stressed personal salvation to the neglect of social redemption. The economic and social world was marked in this period by the rise of the capitalistic system with its emphasis on free competition and personal aggrandizement, influenced strongly by the individualistic theology of Calvinistic Puritanism. Indeed, every aspect of human life tended to glorify the individual. Community existed only to serve the personal. All this had its effect upon the church's life, including its worship.

At the Second Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation Bishop Nygren gave the spiritual descendants of Martin Luther the challenge, "Forward to Luther." Surely, worship is one aspect of the church's faith and life in which we may follow the Reformer's leading.

6 Quoted by A. J. Gossip, *In the Secret Place of the Most High,* 139.
7 *Luther's Works,* Weimar ed., II, 744.

COMMUNISM'S TACTICAL BLUNDERS

By Walter R. Wietzke

LUDWIG FEUERBACH, arch-critic of Christianity and all religion, reached the zenith of his polemical career in 1848 with a series of public lectures on *The Essence of Religion.* Apparently the last word on his significance is found neither in his own pronouncements nor in the apologetics of Christian theologians, but was left to be said by the fathers of Communism. Commenting on Engels' interpretation of Feuerbach, V. I. Lenin made this observation, "Remember that Engels, in his essay on Ludwig Feuerbach, reproaches Feuerbach for fighting against religion not in order to destroy it, but in order to revive it."[1]

This is but one evidence of a boasted historical alertness claimed by Soviet Communism. The Communists' claim to historical astuteness is open to challenge, however, and it is becoming increasingly obvious that these "masters of history" are committing history's most common error, "not to learn from it."

While the patriarchs of dialectical materialism made repeated warnings about wrongly approaching religious forces, their heirs have committed tactical blunders of no little consequence. Perhaps they could blame the first of these on the patriarchs themselves, viz., that of dismissing any religious interpretation of history. In effect this is nothing less than an attempt to move God out of history. This was the character of much thought in the late eighteen and early nineteen hundreds, when men dedicated themselves to a materialism in which God had no real place. Bruno Bauer was the ringleader of this movement in theology, Karl Marx in politics (and the two were not only contemporaries but friends). Their bold atheism went back through Feuerbach to the ancient philosophers Lucretius, Epicurus, and Democritus, all of whom fostered a purely physical philosophy and a materialist conception of history. This did not and does not mean (according to Marxist theory) that their forces should now engage in open scholastic and theological battle. On the contrary, he who is a Marxist is ever reminded that he must be "a materialist, i.e., an enemy of religion. But he must be a dialectical materialist, i.e., one who fights religion not in the abstract, . . . but concretely, on the basis of the class struggle actually proceeding."[2] Lenin stated that the class struggle, rather than "preaching war against God," should be the primary objective, and pointedly affirmed that "the anarchist who preaches war against God at all costs actually helps the priests and the bourgeoisie."[3] "God" for the Marxist becomes less than a relative term; he becomes a nonentity. Any conception of him, especially one which acknowledges him as a personal being who lives and loves and acts and whose will shall decide the ultimate history of this world, is dismissed as naivete and, says the Marx-man, becomes the people's opiate.

1 V. I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism,* 2nd ed. (London: Lawrence & Wishart, Ltd., 1936), p. 193.

2 *Ibid.,* 198.

3 *Ibid.,* 198.

At this point one must acknowledge the consistency of the Communists. They are not trying to serve God and mammon, but only mammon. Nonetheless, their dedicated venture to remove God and sell a godless interpretation of history has as its embarrassing record the fact of a remarkable resurgence of religious forces in the very heart of Communist-dominated territories. God is not dead. He is not even sleeping.

A second tactical error is found in Communism's open opposition to the Gospel and the church. This is but the logical consequence of attempting to move God out of history, for if one opposes God, one must oppose God's Word and God's people. This is the very thing the fathers feared, but either their heirs have not perceived or have not cared whether or not it is a repudiation of patriarchal Communism to move in this direction. "In 1874, commenting on the famous manifesto of the Blanquists, fugitives of the Commune, then emigrants in London, Engels treated their noisy proclamation of war on religion as foolishness and stated that such a declaration of war was the best means of reviving interest in religion, and of hindering its dying out, . . . and in 1877, in 'Anti-Duhring,' Engels, while ruthlessly attacking the slightest concession made by the philosopher Duhring to idealism and religion, condemns no less resolutely Duhring's pseudo-revolutionary notion that religion should be *prohibited* in socialist society."[4]

But the temptation has been too great. The Christian church has not died fast enough for the Party. Measures have been alternately forwarded and withdrawn to hurry the process. Yet, even when these measures have been given the finest of cosmetic sheens, their ultimate intention has not gone undetected. Violent anti-religious acts—never advocated in theory—have become fact on the plane of practice. The Mindszentys and Ordasses were inevitable, and they, like the priests and pastors who were actually murdered, have become the last thing in the world the Party wants—martyrs!

Severely does history set its lesson before them that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." But it takes nobler men than those who capriciously guide the destinies of Soviet materialism, and a system of government possessed of greater virtue, to be theoretically passive to the existence of the church and not overtly vent hate on those who compose it. The 1936 constitution permitted "freedom of worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda," but like kindred measures this was an item of expediency. Though sometimes hailed as an evidence of historical alertness (i.e., not pushing things to the point of open rebellion) it could not change the fact that blood had been spilled and martyrs made, and for this there is politically only repentance, no atonement.

Out of this second disregard of history has come still a third—and what is likely to be the most costly blunder of all—"the displacement of the community." The effort now is not simply against religion, but against surviving nationalisms as well. Men in the West construe the mass deportations as Soviet Communism's

4 *Ibid.*, 194.

most abominable act. The audacity and ruthlessness, to say nothing of the scope, have evoked great concern and generally a spirit of defeatism.

It is certainly a monstrous and evil thing to take a populace by force, as in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, remove them from a homeland, and make them slaves in other Iron Curtain territories. Few of us can begin to appreciate the torment, the frustration, the overwhelming grief of having families torn apart, never to meet. But something of great significance was said under conditions of duress in the early days of the Christian church. It was contained in a letter to a man named Diognetus and was to the effect that for the Christian "every foreign land is a home, and every home a foreign land. . . . [The Christians] spend their days on earth, but hold citizenship in heaven."[5] This fact crosses the centuries. Moreover, we may be in bondage to masters here on earth by their duress, but Christian men are slaves to another Master by volition.

What is significant is this: the catastrophe we contemplate and declare to be the destruction of the church is the one way in which her very existence is guaranteed. The program of destruction by "dispersion" undoubtedly destroys the church in the sense of well defined local parishes, but the church as the people of God? Never! No more than he who works the soil can destroy the milkweed by scattering its pods. While the Western world bemoans and interprets these empirical struggles as sure tokens of defeat, they may in the light of eternity prove to be the very means by which the light of the Christian Gospel is kept burning "in all the world."

The fact that present-day Communism has made tactical blunders should not blind us to another, and less happy, fact: they have had tactical successes as well. Of these the most disastrous has been the silencing of a large number of Christian leaders by payment or threat. And here history has something to say to us, viz., that there is no witness in compromise, no salvation in surrender. The Christian must remember the dialectical character of his faith. He, too, must set it against something—this world. He cannot fight "the world" in the abstract or by means of the abstract, but concretely in those circumstances where God calls on him to be a witness, and "Mammon" asks him to be a partner.

Though it is presumptuous to draw conclusions for God, historically these bear the stamp of warranty: God will not be found without faithful witnesses, however few, even in this struggle, and time, which neither Christian nor Communist controls, will find his Kingdom come and his will done. The paradox—almost unbelievable to behold—is this: that *both* Christian and Communist contribute to its coming! The Christian knowingly, the Communist as an arrogant and unwitting tool of his own godless program. The Christian, who is considered history's victim, may thus become its master; the Communist, reputedly history's master, its victim.

5 *Ancient Christian Writers, The Epistle to Diognetus,* translated by James A. Kleist (Westminster, Maryland, The Newman Press, 1948), p. 139.

BASIC BOOKS FOR THE CLERGY

By Katharine S. Diehl

STOCK IN TRADE for the professions comes in two categories: tradition and experience. Perhaps they are but one, for today so soon becomes tradition and finds its place among similar experiences of our heritage. However it be that we decide, today soon becomes yesterday. That opportunity is passed. The real things and ideas remain. Others fade.

Years ago a good and wise man suggested, "Of the making of books there is no end." Publishers, librarians, readers assent. The bursting point on an individual's time would be reached if only the prefaces to all books in English were carefully read. Add human obligations to the daily schedule and a professional man or woman is torn—until he realizes that tradition is constantly sifting. The important is kept.

Clergymen in America lead community thought. They come to their work with "a call" and are accepted as men and women of God. Days are soon filled with routine appointments of the parish, extraordinary personal and problem-solving conferences with individuals. Time for devotion and study is set apart too.

The study soon becomes a problem—a problem of too many books which are essential reading. To buy them all would require a fortune. To read them all would require many lifetimes. Sifting is absolutely necessary: sifting *for purchase* and sifting *for reading!* "Of the making of books. . . ." If the ancient could not clear his vision of the piles and piles of tablets and scrolls, at least he had a delicious sense of humor! He added, "there is no end!" Amen! and Amen!

That tradition which is meat and drink to the authors of new books comes neatly packaged at low cost. It is the dictionary, the manual, the handbook, the classics in original and translated forms, the proverbs, the holy books, the museum pieces, the arts in buildings, oils, music, liturgy. Of course it requires a bit of gumption to admit that we have not read the recent best-sellers as listed by book review periodicals! Instead we have allocated thirty dollars to a *Webster's New International Dictionary*. And the old fogey so-and-so who seeks and searches out (finds, too) an 11th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is a peculiar one! Alack and alas! He discovers the Everyman's Library, and its *Readers Guide* for a little more than a dollar. That opens the very comfortable and inexpensive series of history, fiction, theology, philosophy, literature. Its delight is special, for the actual cost per volume averages $1.50. The books are basic to today's authors—stories and situations retold, revised, but the frame remains.

Foolishness leads on to the great historical series, the works sponsored by Cambridge, Oxford, and Harvard Universities, to mention but a few. There is earth and its people, era by era. The art and literary and music series too. Series of holy books cut deeply into a quarter's salary! But the wealth of information and inspiration purchased far outweighs a subscription to *any* book club. Contents are refined, reduced, edited—pure data remain. Sometimes there is the sug-

gestion *See . . .*, and there are new words, new associations, new persons, new thoughts!

Add, of course, that dull-looking, delightful piece, a foreign language dictionary. One or another ancient or foreign language is known to most clergymen. A dictionary in that tongue, plus one in another, make a good team. Those will probably soon have a companion or two. It is impossible to *read* without dictionaries, manuals, and a basic encyclopedia. Those especially good ones, issued in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, include the *Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, The Sacred Books of the East.* These are not partisan sets. They are the heritage of every man, woman, and child from Hickory Corners to Princes Street. They are the books and ideas of every man—black, white, yellow, and in-between (biologically and theologically). Add *The Jewish Encyclopedia, The Catholic Encyclopedia, The Encyclopaedia of Islam, The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.*

What else is necessary? Denominational interests will require Wesley, Asbury, Eddy, Joseph Smith, Swedenborg, Luther. And let Lutherans and their friends shout for joy that more of Luther is being translated into English. High time!

Bibles, various editions, translations, and selections. A few of them, a shelf of good dictionaries and histories. Soon the chatty new commentary will seem less important. The clergyman-student will be spiritually with the author of the traditional Psalm, or Prophecy, or Law. He will be making his own commentary—as every scholar does.

Expensive? Yes, if initial cost of single pieces be considered. No, if long-range use is reckoned. *Webster's 2d ed.* will not be out of date in my lifetime—and the *1st ed.* is better still. *The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* has years of life ahead. *The Sacred Books of the East* is being constantly reprinted. *Everyman's Library, The Loeb Classical Library, The Modern Library*—all are deep-down good reading. But none of these is of the generation of the cinemascope, the atom, the space-ship—except as common ancestors. They are simply basic in libraries of our colleges and universities and theological seminaries. And just as basic in the private library of the clergy.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

Lutheran Unity in Japan

In bringing the following "Doctrinal Witness" report of the Committee on Lutheran Unity in Japan before an American audience, a few words of explanation are necessary. Some distinguished visitors from America have come to Japan with preconceived notions of what an "All Lutheran Free Conference" is and have decidedly misunderstood what this movement represents and the significance it has.

Since the war the Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church has sincerely and enthusiastically welcomed each new Lutheran group as it came to Japan, and the All Lutheran Free Conference represents a correspondingly heart-felt response to this welcome. The name seems to call forth antipathy on the part of some, but was agreed upon in Japan because of what I shall call "home-base caution." From the beginning the several groups have frankly faced existing differences while being joyfully aware of the far greater areas of similarity, and a spirit of *cooperation* has characterized all of its activities during the five years since the All Lutheran Free Conference came into being.

Conscious that the desire for unity had grown with the increasing awareness of the unity already possessed, Dr. Sigurd Aske and the undersigned, as secretary and president of the Conference, arranged the program for the October, 1953, Conference in Nara around the theme of "Lutheran Unity in Japan." The reaction was so overwhelmingly favorable that the above-named committee was authorized, and shortly began work as two sub-committees, one working on the doctrinal issues, the other on the practical implications. The goal is "all Lutherans in Japan cooperating in a single Lutheran Church." Since the practical aspect will be of less interest generally, we reprint here only the "Doctrinal Witness" portion of the report which has been sent to all concerned churches, boards, and missions. Their several reactions will be considered at the April 19, 1955, meeting of the Committee. Lutherans in Japan beseech your prayers for the success of this undertaking according to the will of God.

The following groups are members of the All Lutheran Free Conference and have been represented on the Committee. Those bodies marked with an asterisk are at present cooperating members of the Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church.

1. Augustana Lutheran Mission, Japan*
2. Evangelical Lutheran Church, Japan Mission*
3. Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church
4. Japan Lutheran Missionaries Association of the ULCA*
5. Japan Mission of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod
6. Japan Mission of the Soumi Synod

7. Lutheran Brethren Mission of Japan

8. Lutheran Evangelical Association of Finland, Japan Mission*

9. Lutheran Free Church of Norway, Japan Mission

10. Norwegian Lutheran Mission

11. Norwegian Missionary Society

Only Nos. 3, 4, and 8 were in Japan before World War II. The total number of Lutheran missionaries of all groups in Japan is now more than 250, and the comity arrangement effected by the All Lutheran Free Conference has distributed Lutheranism over the entire country. The work of all groups has been highly blessed by the Japan Lutheran Hour. Following is the full text of the "Doctrinal Witness."

"We, the officially delegated representatives of the respective Lutheran Churches and Mission Societies in Japan, present this Doctrinal Witness as a testimony to the unity in faith which the Holy Spirit has created among us and as a proclamation of the distinctive message of Lutheranism. This declaration is not to be regarded as a complete exposition of Lutheran doctrine, as it is found in Holy Scripture and set forth in the three Ecumenical Creeds, in the Catechisms of Martin Luther, and in the historic Lutheran Confessions to which Lutheranism subscribes. It is rather a simple witness to the fundamental scriptural truths of Lutheranism.

Sola Scriptura

"1. We are united in proclaiming Jesus Christ, true God and true Man, as the Way among all other ways, the Truth among all other claims to religious truth, and the Life among all other promises of life.

"2. This affirmation is not a human discovery or an intellectual achievement; it is the revelation of God.

"3. We believe that the whole revelation of God to men which reached completion in Christ, the Crucified and Risen Saviour, is faithfully recorded and preserved in the Holy Scriptures, through which alone it comes to us.

"4. We hold that the Bible, as a whole and in all its parts, is the Word of God given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

"5. By 'inspiration of the Scriptures' we mean that a special operation of the Holy Spirit caused his chosen agents to say the things he wanted said, and to write the things he wanted written, in the manner in which he wanted them said or written.

"6. We confess that the Holy Scriptures are our only authentic, infallible, and completely adequate source and norm of Christian doctrine and life.

"7. These truths can be comprehended only by faith.

Sola Fide

"8. We affirm that man is reconciled to God and saved only by faith in Christ who atoned for the sins of all men by his vicarious death.

"9. By this principle we affirm that faith alone can appropriate the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.

"10. This saving faith is absolutely and unconditionally the gift of God which no man can deserve, earn, or be by nature inclined to accept.

Sola Gratis

"11. We believe that man is saved by grace alone.

"12. This grace is offered man in the Gospel and in the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

"13. The Holy Spirit gives to all Christians gifts of grace to be used for the furtherance and growth of the Body of Christ. These gifts include both the fruits of the Spirit in the life of the believer and gifts conferred for the performance of specific ministrations within the life of the church.

"14. We hold that the church of Christ exists wherever the Gospel is rightly preached and the sacraments rightly administered.

"15. We proclaim the Gospel by word and deed with complete trust in the promise that the Word of God shall not return to him void but shall accomplish his gracious purposes."

B. Paul Huddle

Werner Elert on Preaching and the Liturgy

The untimely death on Nov. 21, 1954, of Werner Elert, professor of Theology in the university of Erlangen, Bavaria, is a serious loss not only to Erlangen and to German theology but also to world Lutheranism. He is perhaps best known in North America for his two-volume *Morphologie des Luthertums* (Munich, 1931, 1932). During and since World War II his Dogmatics and his Ethics were published, and more recently he devoted his considerable energy and the resources of his vast scholarship to studies in the ancient church. Elert turned in this direction in his later years because he was more and more persuaded that Protestants in general and Lutherans in particular had surrendered Patristics to Roman Catholic scholars and that the altogether natural, but apologetic, interests of these scholars colored conclusions and made it increasingly difficult to get at the truth. The first major fruit of Elert's new studies was published in his *Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der alten Kirche* (Berlin, 1954), a study which sheds important new light on current ecumenical discussions. A few weeks before his unexpected death, at a meeting of the General Synod of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany (VELKD), he participated in a discussion which preceded the adoption of the first part of a new liturgy for that church. His extempore remarks on this occasion are here translated from the *Informationsdienst der VELKD* (January, 1955) both in memory of this distinguished theologian and churchman and also on account of their significance for American as well as European Lutheranism.

"In the historical part of *Leiturgia* [see The Lutheran Quarterly, VI (1954), 181, 182] it is asserted that Luther really did not achieve a proper understanding of public worship. When one goes on to consider the conception of worship which is set forth in this study, one finds that it rests, quite understandably and properly, on a consideration of historical development. The liturgical life of the church is of course an historical phenomenon which must be traced to its origins. Now, it is to be

observed (and this can easily be established by anyone who is familiar with the literature) that the description of the beginnings of Christian worship which is offered in *Leiturgia* follows the description given by Roman Catholics on the basis of the very outstanding investigations which have been made in recent decades by Benedictines especially, and more recently also by Jesuits. Lutheran liturgiologists rest their case, insofar as the historical treatment is concerned, on these investigations. I do not intend to criticize the work of the Benedictines, for everyone knows how much thorough knowledge, how much quiet objectivity, and how little polemic is involved in it. However, we cannot and should not expect that these Catholic brethren are in a position to understand and present, even in the history of worship, what was of concern to Luther. If Luther is to be judged by the norms which are basic to the Benedictine interpretation, it can indeed be said that he did not really understand what worship is.

"Over against this charge I should assert that, if it can at all be said that Luther reached back beyond the Middle Ages to the ancient church, this was especially true in his restoration of preaching to an important and central place. The contrary opinion with regard to public worship in the ancient church is so widely held that I cannot hope to counteract it effectively in the few moments at my disposal here. But I cannot refrain from mentioning a few little things which the reader of the sources will encounter and to which the literature makes some reference. We are today given the impression that worship in the ancient church was quite exclusively liturgical —as we still find it, for example, in Eastern Orthodox churches. But in a sermon one of the ancient Church Fathers sets forth in very vivid fashion the fault he has to find with the contemporary liturgical service. The congregation is not there, he reports. The people are wandering about outside, the boys and girls lounging about during the performance of the liturgy. They have a watchman posted at the door, however, and when the distribution of the elements in Holy Communion is about to begin, a signal is given and the young people rush into the church like a pack of hounds, snatch up the host from the clergyman's hands as a dog snatches up a piece of meat, and then depart. I am not suggesting that this sort of thing was the general practice, but it happened.

"I have a different understanding of preaching from that [set forth in *Leiturgia*]. The preaching of the ancient church . . . was doctrinal preaching. It was an expression of the orthodox faith of the church at that time. Accordingly it is subject to the prejudiced charge which is leveled against all forms of orthodoxy, including the orthodoxy of our time, that the preaching was dry and irrelevant and of interest only to learned theologians. I wish that you could see some of the few extant fragments of paper on which stenographers recorded sermons. Perhaps you are aware that the extant sermons of the great Church Fathers, including those of Augustine, were not written by themselves but were recorded by stenographers. When one

sees and deciphers the hastily written shorthand notes of the stenographers, one can get an impression of what preaching was like at that time. Sermons were not dull doctrinal addresses in our sense of the term. Congregations were attentive. Records reveal the tremendous, dramatic emotion which the sermons evoked, even the cries with which the auditors interrupted the preacher. The stenographic reports give us all sorts of information, even that Augustine had a bad cough on one occasion. This is alluded to in a passing remark, 'Pardon me, I could not help coughing, for I have been preaching a great deal the last few days.'

"If one reads the great sermons on the dogma of the ancient church which Gregory Nazianzen preached in Constantinople before he was elevated to the patriarchate—the entire dogma of the ancient church is contained in four sermons which have been published on the basis of stenographic reports—one must be astonished at the intellectual and spiritual power of the preacher, who was able to communicate the teaching of the church to his hearers in such a compact, vivid, and existential manner, for what he treated concerned life and death. This is what services were like in the ancient church. Our honored liturgiologists . . . will say that all of this is well known. But there is still danger that we misinterpret the ancient church when we see it only in the light of the Benedictine investigations and inquire only about the origin of the Kyrie and ask when the Hallelujah was first employed. . . .

"The impression has gone abroad, and our liturgiologists are at least partly to blame for this, that the preaching, teaching church is to be replaced in some sense by the liturgical church."

Theodore G. Tappert

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Revelation and Religion. By Herbert H. Farmer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 244 pages. $3.50.

Once again we have striking evidence that our British friends are masters of the English language. One would expect the Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge to write well, but there is more to it than that: as with Bertrand Russell in philosophy, or Bishop Bell or Canon Raven in religion, these Britishers far surpass all others in the clarity and verve with which they deal with the most difficult topics. This is no minor matter, moreover, for one of the deplorable features of centuries of religious thought is the downright obscurity and confusion with which so much of it is plagued. Professor Farmer, in this first volume of the famous Gifford lectures, does a wonderfully clear piece of writing.

His central purpose is to classify and evaluate the religions of mankind *from the Christian point of view.* Though it seems to contradict what I said above, this purpose is certainly not conveyed—as Farmer is the first to admit—by the title of his book. The sub-title helps—Studies in the Theological Interpretation of Religious Types—but not too much. What he is really after is an interpretation of all the varied religions from the standpoint of the Christian revelation which is the basis of Christian theology. The propriety of such a study, he says, was confirmed in his mind when, in the first volume of Paul Tillich's Gifford Lectures, Professor Tillich spoke of the need for a "theological history of religion." This is what Professor Farmer attempts.

He wisely faces at the outset (though this makes the going a bit rough for the reader, as he concedes) the question of how "natural theology" and "Christian philosophy" are to be understood and how they are related. This is honest and courageous, but dangerous, for the author's proposed study thereby places him in the very awkward position of another well-known Gifford Lecturer, Karl Barth, who also had to defend and justify what he was proposing to do as being within the terms of this world's most distinguished lectureship in the field of religion. Barth, it may be recalled, in his lectures, *The Knowledge of God,* frankly stated (as every student of religion very well knew) that he could not "directly" do this because, as a Reformed theologian, he didn't believe in the validity of natural theology. I am not sure that the present author is really in any more justifiable position, for Barth at least quoted the clear terms of the Lectureship about natural theology as a strict natural science like chemistry and astronomy "without any reference to or reliance upon any supposed special exceptional or so-called miraculous revelation," and, more, that its purpose is the "promoting, advancing, teaching and diffusing" of the study of such natural theology. In Barth's case the whole *purpose* of his book, as a Gifford Lecture amounted to something of a travesty, so much so that one wonders whether he should have accepted the invitation in the first place. Professor Farmer distinguishes four different meanings of "natural theology," approving only of the one which sees it as "the attempt to present theism as a reasonable and satisfying . . . though not logically demonstrative world-view" (p. 8). I have written the above to let the present reader decide whether, if at all, this can serve the terms of the lectureship. I think it strains the point severely—though not as disastrously as did Barth!—and that the situation is even worse when Farmer proceeds to say that the heart of Christianity is in revelation and supremely in the incarnation, and finally that he proposes to measure all religions by this stand-

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

ard. As the English would say "Now, really!" Is this what Lord Gifford meant by natural theology and does this book advance and promote its study?

Taking the Christian revelation as normative, then, Farmer proposes to inquire into the essential elements of the Christian encounter with, and apprehension of, God as personal, and to evaluate all other religious phenomena in the light of this norm. (Note clearly that, according to this view, Farmer, unlike Brunner, believes that Christianity is to be studied as one religion among many, but that it is distinctive and normative in that Christian revelation is in form and content personal. Other religions are not, at least in the same ways and degrees, which is why they are not normative. But he must first analyze the elements of this normative (Christian) religion, and this he claims can best be done *via* worship. This, in turn, leads him to elements which later become criteria, namely: the apprehension and encounter of God as a) ontologically other ("the ultimate source of all being"), b) axiologically other (i.e., "the realized perfection of all value . . ."), c) personal, d) making an absolute claim, e) giving all to his creatures, f) intimately present in the worshipper's own being, g) creating a feeling-tone of reverence and of the holy. Succeeding chapters analyze, as would be expected, primitive and polytheistic religions, those which emphasize primarily dependence, obligation, unification and the other elements indicated above. In all this the author is fair, informed and informing. In terms of the history, psychology, sociology, as well as the theology of the various religions, his writing is competent and wise. I hope I have in passing given indication of his ability to illumine the material with superb writing: his phrases about deity as ontologically other—absolute Reality—and axiologically other—absolute Value—are good examples.

Two fundamental problems about the book were already indicated (i.e., its understanding of the nature and role of natural theology, and the question of the arbitrariness of its whole normative standpoint); I must in closing draw attention to additional questions, some of which are not necessarily negative criticisms. First, excellent as is his criticism of Brunner's claims for the exclusiveness of Christianity, why does Farmer not examine critically Brunner's (and his own) acceptance of the *personal* as normative? A good graduate student in philosophy would surely ask: is there no other or higher standard? Why or why not? Second, he claims that the objectivity with which some claim to study religion is illusory—that they "never can escape subjectively conditioned judgment." The examples he cites, however, and the claim here made, fail to convince. Often it is simply that different definitions are used in the first place; furthermore, one may examine the elements present in all religions, as Royce, James, and others have done. Third, the treatment of Wieman's views of god are a bit cavalier, certainly too brief. One question is whether god is best conceived ultimately as personal—and before answering that one hastily, remember the failing of all human language and the views of many able Christian thinkers. Another question is whether it is ever prudent to refer to god as personal—as with children—though as students of religion one thinks differently. It is irrelevant to talk about deception: Wieman abhors that as much as anyone. It is simply a question of how best to convey meaning. A careful semantic study of the Greek and other sources of the use of the term "person" would be fruitful and probably would make us hesitate to take Farmer's, Brunner's and the similar position of others. I don't see that the insights and truth of Christianity stand or fall with the cenception of personality as applied to deity; future generations may find a far better category.

It takes a good book thus to stimulate thought and raise questions and objections. This is an excellent book by an obviously wise and sincere Christian.

CHARLES W. KEGLEY

Entmythologisierung und Kirche. By Friedrich Gogarten. Stuttgart: Vorwerk-Verlag, 1953. 103 pages. D.M. 5.70.

Friedrich Gogarten, one of the leading spirits in our generation in the field of systematic theology, examines the principles of

theological thinking that underlie the controversy about demythologizing the New Testament. To this reviewer his study seems to be one of the most thought provoking contributions in the discussion of this basic problem of modern exegesis.

Gogarten shows that the fundamental issue in the whole controversy is our concept of the Word of God, and of faith in the Word of God. In both respects a complete reorientation of our thinking is necessary. Gogarten rejects the view that Bultmann chiefly wants to reconcile faith with modern thinking. The future of faith as such needs to be reconsidered. This can only be done by a reconsideration of our concept of the Word of God.

Gogarten undergirds his view of the Word of God with an analysis of the development of historical thinking. Man of the Middle Ages sees himself embedded in a great organic development that presses forward according to the plans of God toward a goal. The individual and the individual's responsibility are becoming lost. Man stands over against a metaphysical objective reality for which he does not feel responsible. Modern thinking sees the uniqueness of the individual and his unique responsibility and consequently sees him responsible for the condition of the world. That means that man now sees himself entirely as an historical being. He does not merely have history *over against* himself; it is he who *makes* history, he himself *is* history. There is no longer an objective universe with its history and man over against it as a subject, but the subject is entirely a part of the whole.

This new aspect, which, however, according to Gogarten, was already the aspect of the New Testament and has only to be rediscovered in modern times, transforms our understanding of the Word of God. The Word of God becomes definitely an historical entity. Here lies the polemic significance of Gogarten's study which is expressed in its title. The immediate purpose of the book is an examination of the pronouncement of Lutheran theologians against Bultmann, "Ein Wort lutherischer Theologie zur Entmythologisierung" (ed. Ernst Kinder, Muenchen, 1952) which is taken as an outstanding example of the reaction of the Lutheran Church in Germany against Bultmann's views. These pronouncements claim that in Bultmann's approach the whole objective content of the New Testament becomes lost. The question is asked whether Bultmann's concept of revelation is still necessarily bound up with a certain fact of revelation in history which is the basic foundation as well as the indispensable content of faith. And the answer is given that the kerygma of the New Testament according to Bultmann's interpretation represents only a subjective conviction and piety of the congregation without objective foundation, and therefore without power, emptied and ultimately meaningless. Therefore the decision of faith is, in Bultmann's view, dangerously near to self suggestion, self-deceit, and illusion.

This whole criticism, says Gogarten, is entirely beside the point. To him it is based upon an outmoded philosophical and historical way of thinking. We cannot establish a difference between the objective fact that constitutes the divine revelation on the one hand, and the Word of God that proclaims these facts on the other hand. Both belong together and are one in the Word of God. If Bultmann's critics say: there must not only be the "actum" in the Word but also the "factum" in the event, then Gogarten answers: the actum *is* the factum. The facts of the history of revelation come to us only *in* the Word and *through* the Word. They are identical with the Word. Therefore we have not to fear for our faith if historical criticism should prove that biblical reports are unhistorical. They have their meaning to us not as historical facts but as a message from God. They have their historical meaning for the history of the reader through the message that they bring to him. That is what Bultmann calls their significance (*Bedeutsamkeit*). His so-called "existential interpretation" tries to understand the historicity of the New Testament in a way that is in accordance with the true nature of history.

It is Gogarten's basic intention to show the complete identity of the Word of God with the deed of God. There is not a deed which God first does, and which is after-

wards proclaimed and explained through the Word, but God acts through the Word, we have him only in the Word and in no other way. This statement contains an all important truth. Certainly, we receive God's actions only through his Word, and no mere information *about* the deeds of God can be of any value to us if this informative Word does not at the same time strike us with the power of a divine address to us. And yet we may doubt whether Gogarten is quite right if he quotes Luther in favor of a view that completely identifies word and action of God. He mentions the hymn "Dear Christians, let us all rejoice." But is it not a fact that is stated in the line: "The Son obeyed the Father's voice?" Or if we take the Christmas hymn: "Den aller Welt Kreis nie umschloss, der liegt hier in Marien Schoss." Is it really possible to eliminate the concept of an act of God, which in itself is unapproachable and meets *us* only in the Word, but which *underlies* the message of the Word?

We agree that the kerygma cannot be examined by means of historical criticism. By virtue of its very nature it goes beyond historical interrelation. It has its reliability exclusively in itself and nowhere else. And as far as miracles are concerned (see Gogarten, p. 100) it is true that the time of Christ thought in terms of miracles whereas we do not, and Gogarten is right in his conclusion that thinking in terms of miracles is just as much thinking in terms of a certain philosophy as thinking in concepts that eliminate miracles as modern science does. But does not this very insight lead to the result that the deeds of God move in a realm that lies *beyond* human concepts? And that therefore the one who tries to disprove miracles in an historical way and to interpret them by an existential method is just as bound by a philosophy as the one who tries to give an historical proof for miracles? Would it not be the right thing for a critical study of the Bible to show the landmarks where historical criticism ends and where the realm begins that lies beyond the interrelation of history, and that therefore simply must be left where it stands and be heard as the word of God's unsearchable deeds?

Whoever wants to clarify his thoughts on the relation of revelation to history ought to study this little book in order to develop his own thoughts in agreement or objection. The study would be even more enjoyable if Bultmann's opponents were treated with a less acid sarcasm. This derisive attitude sometimes makes you forget that you are listening to a *mutuum colloquium* of Christian brethren about divine truth.

PAUL LEO

The Theology of Evangelism. By T. A. Kantonen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954. 98 pages. $1.25.

The revival of evangelism is often the expression of reaction against the neglect by the church of some vital element in its message. Because a "dead" church has frequently coexisted with an overemphasis on "orthodoxism," evangelism has sometimes been unsympathetic toward and suspicious of theology. This kind of a situation has not infrequently resulted in a schism in which evangelism has gone its own way without reference to theology and in which theology has stopped short of working itself out into evangelism.

In his Settles Foundation Lectures, entitled *The Theology of Evangelism,* Professor Kantonen attempts to forestall a recurrence of this schism in our day by building a bridge between the two. To the evangelist he propounds the thesis that evangelism is founded not upon "isolated texts, concepts or practices, but upon the total meaning of the Christian faith," and that therefore any evangelism worthy of the name must have its roots in the real nature of Christian truth. To the theologian he says, "The Church has a right to expect its theologians to draw the content of their thinking from the Gospel and to help to release its power into the life and work of the Church."

Having stated his thesis that the roots of evangelism are to be found in the very nature of Christian truth, Dr. Kantonen proceeds to relate evangelism to the total meaning of the Christian faith, devoting a

lecture each to *God the Creator, God the Redeemer* and *God the Sanctifier.* In each of these the author has a twofold purpose in mind: first, to indicate the positive contribution of each to evangelism and, second, to point out those correctives of a false evangelism which each contains.

In the preparation of this book Dr. Kantonen has rendered the Church a real service. In a day when evangelism is not only on the rise but very much on the march, it is timely to have a handbook which one can with confidence put into the hands of both theologians and evangelists.

GEORGE AUS

Readings in the Philosophy of Religion. By John A. Mourant. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1954. 500 pages.

Mr. Mourant has planned this book in order to present at first hand the more significant answers that have been given both in the past and in the present to some of the basic questions that fall within the philosophy of religion. The book is intended for use as a textbook. The author does not suggest any theological or philosophical viewpoint of his own, although at certain points in the commentary he indicates his preference for a theistic position. The principal aim of the book is to stimulate the interest of the student in the basic problems of the philosophy of religion by directing him to the original sources. The selections have been drawn from a wide range of philosophical traditions, such as scepticism, scholasticism, rationalism, and idealism. Different religious traditions are represented, although Western thought and the Christian tradition receive more attention than any others because they have a background familiar to the student. The author or compiler acknowledges that many readers could suggest important writers and selections that have been omitted, but he claims to have given adequate representation to the major problems.

The book is organized in five parts. Part One, entitled "God," is subdivided into "The Existence of God," "The Nature of God," and "Some Contemporary Perspectives on God." Selections are given from the writings of Calvin, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, Pascal, Feuerbach, Maimonides, Cajetan, Hume, Spinoza, Sankara, Alexander, Schweitzer, Buber and Maritain. Part Two. "Mysticism," is represented by Pascal, Underhill, Plotinus, Patanjali, Eckhart, St. John of the Cross, Ruysbroek, Molinas and Fox. The other parts, "Faith," "Evil," and "Eschatology" follow the same pattern. Each of the five parts is preceded by a fair and accurate introduction and each selection is introduced by a brief biographical note and a paragraph suggesting the problem and themes dealt with by the writer.

Mr. Mourant presents no theological or philosophical position with which one can argue, and no reader is likely to quibble about the selection of writers. The book would serve as an excellent text for a course in the philosophy of religion in college or seminary. It has a detailed and helpful index. Such direct acquaintance with profound minds is useful for everyone—student, teacher, or pastor.

HAROLD H. DITMANSON

The Philosophy of Revelation. By Herman Bavinck. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953. 349 pages. $3.50.

Herman Bavinck, one of the foremost Reformed theologians of modern times, was a man of impressive learning and broad sympathies. Together with Abraham Kuyper, Benjamin Warfield and James Orr, he produced a formidable defense of theism during the early part of this century. The present volume contains the six Stone lectures on the philosophy of revelation delivered in Princeton in 1908-09 and four other lectures delivered elsewhere about the same time. In these lectures Bavinck develops his idea of a philosophy of revelation and its implications for philosophy, nature, history, religion, Christianity, religious experience, culture, and the future. His point of view is that the world is unexplainable without God, that physics, history, psychology, etc., presuppose metaphysics, and that none of these studies are intelligible or meaningful apart from special revelation.

This book is a vigorous and learned vindication of supernaturalism. Bavinck affirms

the classic themes of Christian theism—the transcendence and personality of God, the creaturehood, rationality and freedom of man, and the reality, contingency and knowability of the physical universe. He sets the implications of these basic propositions over against scepticism, atheism, humanism, pragmatism and monism in its several forms. Perhaps the most memorable feature of the book is its sustained and intricate polemic against monism. It is obvious that Bavinck possessed a profound and detailed knowledge of 19th century thought and that he was a skilled controversialist. The central theme of his argument is clear and, despite shifts in theological and philosophical positions during the intervening half-century, his case for theism is convincing. In addition to a sturdy and valid line of argument, the book yields many fine insights into classical philosophical systems, theological topics such as grace, special revelation and conversion, and episodes in the history of doctrine.

The principal defect of the book cannot be attributed to the author. It is scarcely his fault that the orchestration for his theme sounds distinctly "dated." Since a large part of the book consists of a detailed exposition and refutation of the views of men whose work has since been superseded, it appears to be a chapter in the history of Christian thought, rather than an important and living contribution to current theological study.

HAROLD A. DITMANSON

Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period. Edited by Salo W. Baron and Joseph L. Blau. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1954. xxvi and 245 pages, paper cover. $1.75.

This is a source book edited with an introduction and notes by the professor of Jewish history and an assistant professor of philosophy at Columbia University. It is the third volume to appear in a series of nine, to be entitled *The Library of Religion.* The editorial board, headed by Herbert W. Schneider, announces the purpose of the whole series to be "to make available to American students the most essential texts in the religious literature of the world." From the rather specialized titles already announced, it would appear that the number in the series may ultimately run to many more volumes. The only title so far announced for Christianity is *Eastern Orthodox Christianity; Buddhism* and *Hellenistic Religions* have already been published.

The present volume will fill a gap in the available material in English for readers who need guidance on the developments in Judaism from the Maccabean Age to the close of the fifth century A.D. Part I contains ten selections from the Old Testament Apocrypha with appropriate short introductions supplementing the twenty-six pages of general introduction to the book as a whole. Part II contains selections from Philo and Josephus, viewed as Hellenistic Jewish authors. The readings from Philo are so interesting as to raise a question in the mind of the reviewer. Has Philo been given his due place in our standard English histories of philosophy? Bertrand Russell in his *History of Western Philosophy* grants him one short paragraph out of nine hundred pages! Part III is devoted to the Jewish sects from the Samaritans to the New Covenanters about whom we have been hearing so much since 1947, when the first of the Dead Sea scrolls came to light. Included in the readings about the sects is Josephus' famous description of the Essenes in his *Wars of the Jews.* The last two parts of the book (pages 99-229) are devoted to the Mishnah and the Talmud and are of great interest and value to anyone who is a beginner in this field (few Christians have attained any eminence as Talmudic scholars). Since the work of Strack and Billerbeck first drew the Christian world's attention to the Talmud as background for the study of the gospels, none of us can afford not to be at least a beginner! For example, the thirteen rules of rabbinic hermeneutics (pages 107-108), some of which are illustrated elsewhere in the rabbinic comments on scripture contained in these selected readings, help us to understand the use of the Old Testament by New Testament writers living in the same milieu as the Tannaites.

The Tannaites were the earliest expounders of the Scriptures in postbiblical Judaism. They begin with Simeon the Just about 175

B.C. and continue to Rabbi Eliezer, about A.D. 200. It was in this period that almost all of the Old Testament Apocrypha and all of the New Testament Scriptures were written. While the books of the New Testament were appearing in Christian circles, the Tannaites were developing the Mishnah and the Midrash, both of which grew out of earlier oral traditions with elements as old as the Old Testament itself, but coming down independently of the canonical books. The relevance to New Testament studies should be at once apparent since the main business of the Jewish rabbis was the investigation, elucidation and application of Old Testament truth. Their Christian contemporaries were occupied in parallel investigations, elucidations, and applications of the Old Testament which for all practical purposes was the Bible of the church. The New Testament canon was far from complete and still in a fluid condition at the close of the Tannaitic age.

The last century of the Tannaites (A.D. 100-200) was an age of preaching. The so-called Halakhic Midrashim are synagogue sermons delivered on sabbaths and holidays and based on the pericopes of the Pentateuch read as the daily or weekly scripture lesson. Three examples of this fascinating material are given on pages 120-131. They are worthy of the closest examination as the earliest examples of biblical preaching which we have outside the Book of the Acts and as throwing light on the history of Old Testament homiletic exegesis just at the point where church and synagogue were going their separate ways. The following bibliography of this material, which calls, I believe, for careful study by Christian biblical scholars and church historians, is offered in the notes (pages 234-235); *Mekhilta,* Tractate Bahodesh: English transl. by Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Philadelphia; Jewish Publ. Soc. of America, 1933; *Mekhilta,* Tractate Nezikin, English transl. by the same, Philadelphia, 1936; *Midrash Sifre on Numbers, Selections From Early Scriptural Interpretations,* Engl. tr. by Paul P. Levertoff, London, A. Golub, 1926.

The rabbis whose teachings make up the Talmud belong to the next three centuries (A.D. 200-500). They are known as the Amoraim and had their centers in Palestine and Babylon. They were trying to do for Judaism what the Christian fathers were trying to do for the formative period of the Catholic church. In spite of the deep gulf between them, certain theological and moral problems of the Amoraic age were common to both, and parallel trends are discernible. Both fought the gnostics and the paganism of declining Rome. Both faced the problem of increasing social disorder under the impact of the barbarians. No one, to my knowledge, has yet attempted a synthesis of these common trends by relating the materials in the Talmud to Christian church history. There was in this precise age something more than "the conflict of Christianity with heathenism." Within limits the Church had an *unacknowledged* but not a *silent* partner in organized Judaism. Perhaps it was this double attack which caused paganism's collapse. It is also to be discerned that some theological developments in Christianity were in this early Catholic period more Jewish than Christian. The solutions reached then had to be undone and done over in the Reformation. It was not so much a direct mutual influence as a common mentality which marked Jew and Christian on the threshold of the dark ages in their parallel enterprises.

A final section in this book treats of prayer. Here are traditional Jewish prayers taking form side by side with the ancient collects and liturgies of the Church. Two long hymns of unusual poetic merit and devotional strength are reproduced at the very end. They are new material from the Dead Sea Scrolls, first published in English translation by E. Margaret Rowley from the French of Dupont-Sommer in 1952.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

Ancient Israel. By Harry M. Orlinsky. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954. ix + 193 pages. $2.50.

The Cornell University Press is issuing a series of texts on "The Development of Western Civilization" edited by Edward W. Fox, in which this volume is one of the first to appear. Harry M. Orlinsky, the au-

thor of *Ancient Israel,* is a recognized leader among American biblical scholars of our day and is at present identified with Hebrew Union College (Cincinnati) and the Jewish Institute of Religion (New York). His brief but comprehensive treatment of the history of Israel is both accurate and up-to-date. It is fully indexed and contains an appendix of nine pages entitled, "Suggestions for Further Reading." Here is one of the best summary bibliographies on the Old Testament which has appeared anywhere since Fleming James's *Personalities of the Old Testament* (1940). The titles listed are carefully evaluated and include references to works in English, German, French, and modern Hebrew. More than half of the books described are designated for teachers and advanced readers (pp. 176-182).

The standpoint of the author is non-controversial and moderately conservative. He does not arrogate to himself a wisdom above the Scriptures, nor does he go out of his way to debate opposing views. The book is less compressed than W. F. Albright's well known coverage of the same subject matter entitled *The Biblical Period* (1949) and it requires less elucidation by the teacher than is necessary in the case of the latter.

A number of conclusions reached by Orlinsky are of special interest to students of the Old Testament. These differ from the views widely held by scholars a generation or less ago. Examples are the following: *a*) patriarchal religion (before Moses) was a practical monotheism and included a personal covenant between the patriarchal families and their God (p. 29); *b*) there was an actual "Tabernacle or Tent of Meeting" in the period of Israel's sojourn in Sinai (p. 38); *c*) an important part of the legal code of ancient Israel is pre-Canaanite and coincides in date with the Hebrew wandering in the wilderness (p. 40); *d*) the historical value of Joshua chapters 1-11 (the story of the invasion under Joshua) has been generally underrated by scholars until recently (pp. 49-50); *e*) the Book of Esther, while not factual throughout, "may safely be considered as a reflection of fact" (p. 134); *f*) chapters 40-66 of the Book of Isaiah are to be ascribed to a great prophet who arose in the turbulent period of the Exile "to proclaim to his fellow Jews in Babylon that they were entering a new epoch. He is called nowadays the 'Second Messiah'" (p. 126). Orlinsky apparently does not hold to the possibility of a "Trito-Isaiah" involving the work of one or more prophets after the return from the Exile.

The general position of Orlinsky as a historian of ancient Israel is well stated in his own words (p. 7), "Modern historians do not, to be sure, accept every part of the Bible equally as literal fact. Yet they have come to accept much of the biblical data as constituting unusually reliable historical documents of antiquity, documents which take on new meaning and pertinence when they are analyzed in the light of newly discovered extra-biblical sources." On the same page he adds, "A radical re-evaluation of the significance of the Bible has been necessitated by the archaeological discoveries of the past three decades." On page 146 he affirms that the working of miracles was an integral element in the Hebrew prophetic tradition, mainly before the eighth century. In that century miracles as a medium of the prophets "by which to convince their fellow Israelites of the truth of their teachings" began to be replaced by "the eloquence and logic of their literary compositions." The reviewer regards this account of the gradual disappearance of prophetic miracles in the Old Testament as of considerable interest and would welcome an elaboration of the subject by Orlinsky. Obviously the late miracles recorded in Daniel are not in the prophetic tradition and have a different function from that of convincing fellow-Israelites. The complete absence of recorded miracles in the post-exilic writers coheres with the continuation of prophecy of the literary type until its final expiration.

This work by a Jewish authority is a more constructive re-interpretation of the biblical story than many of the standard histories of Israel by Christian scholars who in the past have been strongly influenced by negating presuppositions. Happily the grounds for these are being removed one after another by continuing research.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

The Righteousness of God, Luther Studies. By Gordon Rupp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 375 pages. $7.50.

Anybody who would like an expert survey of the Luther research of the last fifty years by a scholar who knows the literature, has an open mind and the ability to present his insights lucidly, could do no better than read this study by Dr. Gordon Rupp. The outgrowth of the *Birkbeck Lectures in Ecclesiastical History* delivered in Cambridge University in 1947, the book deals with all aspects of Luther's thought, from an investigation of his early exegetical writings through the much discussed problems of Luther's relationship to Erasmus as well as his controversial interpretation of government. The concluding chapter, "Luther, A Man," contains a moving description of Luther's final trip to Eisleben.

To a field flooded with brilliant and not so brilliant systematic generalizations the author brings the balanced trial and error approach so typical of English scholarship. He doubts vast generalizations and tries to place them against each other and thus gain perspective.

This is a good and useful book. Not all subjects discussed are equally important and except for the chapters on Luther in England and Captain Bell, little is new to those who are familiar with the vast literature in the field. But Dr. Rupp has pulled this information together and made it available to the English-speaking world. The result is an excellent introduction to Luther and recent Luther research. The book has a fine index and an excellent bibliography. Unfortunately, like most books by this publisher, the price seems out of line.

GEORGE W. FORELL

Calvin: Theological Treatises. Edited by J. K. S. Reid. Vol. XXII, The Library of Christian Classics. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.

A considerable portion of the great treasure of Christian literature down to the end of the sixteenth century is being claimed anew for this generation by the publication of *The Library of Christian Classics* under the joint editorship of John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen. The purpose of this commendable undertaking is to present a sound selection of writings from the great mass of Christian literature, newly edited and translated into modern English. A prospectus from the SCM Press indicates the hope that this project of twenty-six volumes will be completed in 1957. Four of the volumes are devoted to Calvin: *The Institutes,* volumes XX and XXI; *Commentaries and Letters,* volume XXIII; and the present volume.

The Theological Treatises demonstrate the ability with which Calvin applied his capacious theological thought to practical as well as theoretical problems. Facing the necessity of being an ecclesiastical administrator, a Reformation apologist before the Emperor, and a defender of his doctrines in controversy with Rome on the one side and Lutherans on the other, Calvin produced the works included in this volume. Part one, in which Calvin the administrator is set forth, is given the title "Statement." Part two, which consists of but one essay, is called "Apologetic" and deals with the necessity of reforming the church. Part three describes Calvin as a controversialist, one incidentally who was quite as sharp and violent as Luther in his polemic outbursts. The treatises selected for this volume also reflect the characteristic Calvinist doctrinal position regarding the sovereignty of God, the authority of the Word of God, predestination, and the Lord's Supper.

Besides providing a handy and well-balanced selection of less frequently read works of John Calvin, this book will prove particularly interesting to the Lutheran reader. For example, when one reads in part one, "The Catechism of the Church in Geneva . . . a Plan for Instructing Children in the Doctrine of Christ," he can hardly avoid comparisons with Luther's catechetical writings, and pity the poor Calvinist child who had to learn the long, involved, and ponderous answers herein set forth. One example is sufficient:

"*Minister:* Why then do you call God merely creator, when it is much more excellent to defend and preserve creatures in

their being, than once to have made them?

"Child: This term does not merely imply that God so created his works once that afterwards he took no care of them. Rather, it is to be held that the world, as it was once made by him, so now is preserved by him, and that similarly both the earth and all other things persist only in so far as they are sustained by his virtue and as it were his hand. Besides, since he has all things under his hand, it also follows from this that he is the supreme ruler and lord of all. Hence from his being Creator of heaven and earth, we are to understand that it is he only who with wisdom, goodness and power rules the whole course and order of nature; who is the author of both rain and drought, hail and other storms, as also of serenity; who fertilizes the earth of his beneficence, or again renders it sterile by withdrawing his hand; from him also both health and disease proceed; to whose power finally all things are subject and at whose nod they obey."

Think of this in the light of Luther's simple, direct, and personal explanation of the First Article of the Creed.

Many other items will be of interest to the Lutheran reader; one additional citation must suffice. It will be remembered that strict Lutherans, Westphal of Hamburg and Heshusius of Heidelberg, attacked Calvin's teaching on the Lord's Supper. Calvin's answer to Heshusius (1561) is included among the Treatises and bears the title, "The Clear Explanation. . . ." It is precisely this: a clear explanation of his own view of the Eucharist and a clear rejection of Luther's doctrine of ubiquity. Although unduly wordy, it makes good reading. It is in this essay that the remarkable apostrophe to the deceased (1560) Melanchthon occurs, revealing the high regard and personal attraction which Calvin felt for Luther's co-laborer:

"O Philip Melanchthon! for I appeal to you who live in the presence of God with Christ, and wait for us there until we are united with you in blessed rest. You said a hundred times, when, weary with labour and oppressed with sadness, you laid your head familiarly on my bosom: Would, would that I could die on this bosom! Since then, I have wished a thousand times that it had been our lot to be together. Certainly you would have been readier to maintain contests, and stronger to despise envy and make short work of false accusations. Thus too a check would have been put on the wickedness of many who grew more audacious in insult by what they called your softness."

One criticism can be made. This reviewer feels that the book would have been more valuable had the introductory notes to each treatise been more extensive. The average reader will find it necessary to supplement the editorial remarks on literary and historical context if he is to be properly oriented to the individual essays. Excellent, however, is the general introduction at the beginning and the bibliography of Calvin literature at the end.

E. Clifford Nelson

Hellenistic Religions. The Age of Syncretism. Edited by Frederick C. Grant. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1953. xxxix and 196 pages. $1.75.

It is fitting that Dr. Grant, a foremost authority in Hellenistic religions, should edit Volume II in the *Library of Religion* which will include the basic writings of the world's religions, past and present. Contemporary New Testament studies pay considerable attention to the double background of the earliest stage of Christianity: Judaism and the universal, world culture of the Hellenistic Age. In this book one will discover a carefully chosen selection of writings from the Hellenistic religions—most of the translations by the editor himself. These are organized into four sections covering institutional religion, the criticism of traditional religion, the cults (Orphism, Oriental, Egyptian, Attis and Mithras), and the religious ideas of the philosophers.

The general reader will find that the editor's extended introduction will be of real value in understanding the scope and significance of Hellenistic religions, their syncretistic characteristic, and their religious and ethical ideas. A concise statement is made defining the nature and importance of Hellenistic philosophy.

Those who desire to deepen their appreciation and understanding of the religious milieu of the New Testament will find this a rewarding study.

Harlan F. Foss

Origen's Treatise on Prayer. By Eric George Jay. London: S.P.C.K., 1954. 237 pages.

The author of this work on Origen justifies it on the ground that students should

know that Origen was not merely a great biblical and philosophical theologian but also a Christian "of rare devotion, a man of prayer." This is indeed a commendable purpose and one which Dr. Jay achieves. However, it should be said that, though the purpose of the book is to reveal the devotional side of Origen, it also casts no little light on both the biblical and theological views of the great Alexandrian. For example, Origen's well known allegorical principle of biblical interpretation is illustrated in his comments on the prayers of Old Testament characters such as Hannah, Hezekiah, Samuel, and Elijah (pp. 116-121, 132-134). Moreover, this devotional treatise is helpful in elucidating Origen's theological subordinationism which, in part, lay at the root of the Arian controversy. This subordinationistic deviation from strict Catholic orthodoxy had two sources: (1) his Platonic conception of deity, and (2) his understanding of certain Scriptural texts. Quoting John 14:28, John 17:3, Mark 10:18, and I Corinthians 15:28 he concluded that the New Testament taught subordinationism. It is interesting to note that Origen's exegetical principle was not employed to make his views consistent with the doctrine of essential Trinity. The literal testimony of these texts, as far as Origen was concerned, spelled subordinationism. Though never denying the essential deity of the Son, Origen nevertheless taught that prayer ought not be addressed to Christ, but rather "to God the Father alone." At this point, Dr. Jay does the service of pointing out Origen's inconsistency. Although he could not justify prayer to Christ theologically, his own profound devotion to Christ "led him both himself to pray boldly to Christ, and to encourage others to do so. . . ."

This same biblical and theological interest is clearly to the fore in that portion of the treatise which is an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Allegorical exegesis is frequently employed as is philosophical theology. The petition for daily bread is a case in point, giving Origen an opportunity to spiritualize bread (quite unlike Luther: "all that belongs to the wants and support of the body") and to give an excursus on the philosophical meaning of the Greek word *ousia* (essence).

It is true that this book will introduce the reader to Origen's devotional life, and for that we are grateful. But not even the most practical of Origen's writings is to be thought of apart from his biblical and philosophical method.

In addition to the translation and the excellent critical apparatus employed by Dr. Jay, the book contains an account of the Christian teaching and practice of prayer from the New Testament up to Origen. Furthermore, a brief survey of Origen's life and doctrine enhance the value of the book and serve as introductory material to the Treatise itself. Dr. Jay, unknown by reputation or previous writings to this reviewer, presented this work as a doctoral dissertation to the theological faculty at the University of London in 1951.

E. Clifford Nelson

Die Ostkirche. By Metropolitan Seraphim. Stuttgart: W. Spemann Verlag. 339 pages. D.M. 10.80.

One of the results of membership in the World Council of Churches has been that we have come into immediate contact with a group of churches that were formerly quite unknown to most Lutherans. They are the Eastern or Orthodox Churches. It must be added, at once, that this direct contact has often proved bewildering. These representatives of ancient churches are, both in their theology and in their devotional life, difficult for us to understand. Any book, therefore, that serves to introduce them to us is valuable indeed.

Such a book is this one coming from Germany. It is edited and partially written by the Orthodox Archbishop of Germany, the primate of the Orthodox metropolitans in Middle Europe.

It opens with a clear presentation of the dogmatic teaching of Orthodoxy. Quite naturally a Lutheran will read this with considerable reserve and questioning. He will find close affinity to the Roman Church in such matters as the attitude toward the Virgin, the seven "mysteries" (sacraments), the miracle-working icons and relics of saints, etc. And he may wonder how a group of churches holding dogmas like these can ad-

just itself harmoniously to the fellowship of the World Council (incidentally, that fellowship is in reality not always harmonious!).

Then follows a brief but helpful history of this branch of Christendom. Since our own church histories tend strongly to emphasize developments in the West, this treatment has special value.

The third section of the book considers briefly the independent churches of the East: the Nestorian, Armenian, Jacobite, Thomas, Coptic and Ethiopian. Here again we find material almost wholly unknown to the Protestant churchman in America. The final portion pictures the Christian life of Orthodoxy. In this connection mention should be made of the fine photographs that truly illuminate the discussion.

JOHN SCHMIDT

Protestantism in America: A Narrative History. By Jerald C. Brauer. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. 307 pages. $3.50.

Dr. Brauer has set himself the not inconsiderable task of telling the complex and many-sided story of American Protestantism for the special benefit of "young people and adult laymen." It is his conviction that the best way to hold the interest of this large segment of our reading populace—untutored in "the technicalities of theology and history"—is to employ a narrative style highlighting the dramatic elements which make up so much of the story of Protestant Christianity in America. It is the judgment of this reader that he has not only succeeded in achieving his purpose but that he has done it with such dash and verve and competency that even the so-called "professional" theologian and historian will find the reading of this book a thoroughly enjoyable and rewarding experience.

Rejecting the view that the only possible way to tell the story of American Protestantism is to write the history of particular denominations, the author finds two threads which he feels can be used to tie up American Christianity in one package. They are (1) "a constant free experimentation and search for a fuller manifestation of God's truth and will," and (2) "a sustained effort to avoid going beyond the truth and light already known in the Bible and codified in certain basic beliefs and confessions." Taking as his text the words of the Reverend John Robinson ("the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of his holy Word"), Dr. Brauer moves swiftly into his exposition and demonstrates that this dual theme recurs in American church history. So clearly does Dr. Brauer's material reveal this "full, free experimentation" and "enduring biblicism" that one wonders why previous chroniclers have not utilized this frame of reference. This, of course, is but to commend the clarity of the author's own discernment.

Throughout the major part of the book Frederick Jackson Turner's "frontier" philosophy of history is consciously or unconsciously to the fore. This is only to the good. The profound influence of the frontier on American Christianity is certainly one of the unique features of the church's life in the New World. To have neglected it would have been a historical blunder of the first magnitude.

There are only a few items which one might desire to see altered. For one thing, this reviewer wishes that the mighty influences of church schools and colleges would have received as much attention as the highly significant phenomenon of American "revivalism." Another thing—admitting that 19th century American Lutheranism may not have played a role comparable to some of the other denominations, nevertheless the contemporary position of Lutheranism on the American scene would seem to demand a fuller treatment of the massive migration of German and Scandinavian Lutherans into the midwest shortly before and after the Civil War. Isolated as they were from much of American life by language and customs, these 19th century American Lutherans were nonetheless learning how to be American and Lutheran at the same time, a needed lesson for the group that in mid-twentieth century was to provoke other Protestants to ask, "Where have you been all my life?"

Incidentally, Lutheran Brauer had better check some Lutheran dates on page 276. He will discover that both the American Lu-

theran Church and the American Lutheran Conference were formed in 1930.

E. Clifford Nelson

The Broadening Church. By Lefferts A. Loetscher. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954. 195 pages. $4.75.

This book in the words of its sub-title is "a study of theological issues in the Presbyterian Church since 1869," the year a reunion of the two groups known as the Old School and the New School brought into being the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It is a brief, straightforward account in broad outline of significant theological trends and controversies from 1869 to 1936. Probably the value of the book is enhanced for the average non-Presbyterian reader by the fact that the discussion is concise rather than detailed. Basically it is an account of the rise of theological liberalism within American Presbyterianism, the resultant conflict between liberalism and conservatism, and the eventual predominance of a moderate viewpoint which is tolerant of theological differences.

There have been strong tensions in American Presbyterianism almost from the beginning because of the existence of two emphases, the one represented by the Scotch-Irish element and the other by the English-Welsh element. The Scotch-Irish emphasis has been characterized by theological conservatism, precise doctrinal formulation, and orderly, somewhat authoritarian church government (Old School). The English-Welsh emphasis has placed less emphasis on doctrinal correctness and orderly churchmanship and more upon "spontaneity, vital impulse, and adaptability" (New School). It is the author's contention these two emphases, while often in tension and conflict, have held the American Presbyterians to a position of moderation. The theological tensions discussed in this book are particularly focused in two periods, 1889-1903 and 1922-36. The issue at stake in each of the named periods was essentially the same, but the outcomes were vastly different.

It was the rapid development of a new theological and cultural atmosphere in America in the post-Civil War years that provides the setting for the controversies discussed. In the face of the evolutionary hypothesis and of modern biblical criticism "liberal theology" makes its appearance as "an attempt to mediate between historic orthodoxy and the radically altered scientific and cultural outlook"; the conservatives rose *en masse* to charge that the liberals "in defending and adapting Christianity were betraying it" (p. 11). Questions relating to the trustworthiness of Scripture agitated the Presbyterians to a much greater extent than those raised by evolution. The nature, authority, and inspiration of the Bible were discussed with great thoroughness over a period of years. The leader of the liberals was Dr. Charles A. Briggs of Union Seminary while the professors of Princeton Seminary, most notably Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. Benjamin Warfield, represented a very conservative viewpoint. The controversy reached its climax in the '90's with the famous heresy trials of Briggs and of Henry Preserved Smith, with the result that both men were declared guilty. The author makes it clear that at the beginning of the twentieth century the staunch conservatives were fully in control of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

During the interval of about two decades prior to the second long and painful controversy the forces of liberalism and of those favoring a policy of moderation gained strength. In those years the famous Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy was taking shape. The issue was forced for the Presbyterians when in 1922 Harry Emerson Fosdick, a Baptist pastor occupying a Presbyterian pulpit in New York City, gave forceful expression to his liberal views. Although Fosdick was placed in a position where he could do nothing but resign, as the controversy developed the strength of "the extreme conservatives" (Loetscher's term) dwindled, and the leadership passed into the hands of a mediating group, generally conservative in theology but favoring a broad policy of toleration. This is seen in the adoption by the General Assembly of the recommendations of the famous "Special Commission of 1925" and in the reorganiza-

tion of Princeton Seminary in 1929. Moderate theological liberalism gained an acknowledged and accepted place in the Presbyterian Church. Under the leadership of J. Gresham Machen, a group of ultraconservatives established Westminster Seminary in 1929, set up an independent foreign mission board, and in 1936 formed a new church body, known today as The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

This thin volume has much of interest and value to offer. It contributes to an understanding of the present character of a major American denomination, and as the reader meets the names of many noted churchmen in these pages, he is reminded of the contributions to evangelical Christianity made by this church of Calvinistic tradition. The importance of Princeton Seminary, where many Lutherans have pursued graduate study in a basically conservative environment, is underscored.

This book serves another useful purpose in that it provides a representative sampling of Protestant church history in the period covered. This story of Presbyterianism is "a kind of theological barometer of the times" (Preface). Similar theological battles were fought out in many American denominations, Lutherans being in the main an exception as their controversies in the same timespan dealt with other issues. Loetscher's book is based upon thorough scholarship as the extensive footnotes and an abbreviated "Bibliographical Note," which appear at the end of the book, testify. Here one is introduced to an extensive literature dealing with the problem of biblical criticism in relation to the topic of inspiration and with the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy.

EUGENE L. FEVOLD

Christian Worship: Some Meanings and Means. By George Hedley. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953. 239 pages plus appendixes and index. $4.50.

This interesting and remarkable book is almost "must reading" for the student who desires to be informed in a brief but basic way about the worship of the Christian church in its manifold expression. Doctor Hedley is chaplain and professor of sociology and economics at Mills College, Oakland, California. This book is one of a series written for the benefit of his students, whom he seeks to serve in an orderly, religious way, and through common worship which shall be acceptable to students from many denominations. In his Preface he says, "The major premise of this book is that the Lord is great, and greatly to be praised. The minor premise is that members of the Christian fellowship have praised him well, and will praise him best, in the usages that through the centuries have grown up within that fellowship. The conclusion is that if we are to worship right, we first must know and understand our heritage of worship, and then must employ it to declare God's glory and our own devotion."

The author's basic point of view might be characterized as historically oriented, and somewhat high church in emphasis. His use of Scripture shows him as somewhat liberal in occasionally accepting as proven the hypotheses of the evolutionary approach in the field of Old Testament study. With the details of the author's presentation, therefore, the experts will find themselves disagreeing here and there. But his breadth of Christiar understanding and his interesting presentation of material must endear him to the average reader. Taken as a whole, the remarkable thing is not the occasional disagreements which one has to register, but the Christian spirit and scholarship which permeate the volume.

Beginning with the simple question, Why Worship? Dr. Hedley presents in an encyclopedic but living and applied way the whole subject of worship and all its aids. Chapters deal with the backgrounds of worship in synagogue and church; the house of God; symbolism; the Christian year; the services; hymnology; prayers; lections; preaching; the sacraments; family worship; form and content in worship and theology. Some of these chapters are remarkable for their brevity, their thoroughness, and their helpful suggestions. The appendixes deal with useful books; variable and fixed dates of the Christian year; arrangement of some current western liturgies; and similar items.

An index of subjects and names completes the usefulness of the volume.

This is a useful and beautiful book on Christian worship. The present reviewer has never before found so much information put together so well and presented so interestingly in any one place. This volume will prove invaluable for the layman as a basic introduction to the fine art of Christian worship.

ALBERT A. JAGNOW

How Our Bible Came to Us. By H. G. G. Herklots. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. 174 pages. $3.50.

Some teachers and students of the Bible fail to profit by the use of modern versions. Others are disturbed by findings of textual criticism. Still others use novel versions just to be different or because they are modern, without an appreciation of their significance. This volume will help the earnest student to a new appreciation of the text of scripture, and the significance and value of the work of scholars and the discoveries of ancient manuscripts.

The author was persuaded to write this book because "There might be some advantage in having a book written by a parish priest, in closer touch, perhaps, with the needs of ordinary Christians and the questions they are asking, than those who are engaged in full-time biblical study and research." So this Director of Christian Education for the diocese of Sheffield, England, writes for the laymen. Yet no person can afford to ignore the contents of this book, if he would be a good Bible student.

The Bible was lived before it was written. Its message was carried by refugees and missionaries into all the world. The story of how it was written, copied, translated and preserved is intensely interesting. There are differences in the various manuscripts. "Nevertheless, despite innumerable differences in detail, our modern knowledge has resulted in few substantial changes in the text of the New Testament. Through the hands of innumerable scribes and copyists it is substantially the same book which has been handed down."

In my judgment this book has a mission to the Bible student. There has been created a fear by the mention of uncertainties of text, by insertion of words to replace those in ancient manuscripts, judged by scholars to be wrong. References to mistakes made by copyists have troubled many. This book is reassuring and faith supporting and a destroyer of fear and uncertainty. Indeed it awakens in the doubter gratitude and joy over the contributions of criticism and archaeology.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

Strövdåg. By Ragnar Stenberg. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokvörlag, 1954. 205 pages. Kr. 9:50.

This is a chronicle of "excursions" or pilgrimages which began at St. Clara Church, one of the great and historic churches in the heart of Stockholm. Thence the eyes are lifted to encompass Stockholm. Thereafter the journeys traverse the waterways that lead forth from Sweden's capital. The waterways lead the traveler out into rural Sweden, where old customs and traditions are still to be observed, even though here too industrialization is evident and the processes of modernization are under way. Because of the pilgrim's basic interest in things Christian, his eyes are everywhere open to churches of venerable history—in Stockholm, Strängnäs, Uppsala, in villages and rural areas. Presently his journeys carry him to Rome, whose churches are visited with appreciative interest. There the deep interest in Christianity's historic expressions, which is constantly in evidence, turns the pilgrim's feet towards Assisi, where one walks solemnly in the footsteps of St. Francis. There too he finds himself at the site of the earliest cloister of nuns of the Franciscan movement. This order was named after St. Clara; and it was the same St. Clara after whom St. Clara Church in Stockholm—where the journeys began—was named. These thirteenth century associations carry the traveler back to his native Sweden, there to journey with understanding heart in the footsteps of saints and heroes who laid the church's early foundations in that land.

The author of this work, a pastor in the Church of Sweden, writes a Swedish which

it is a joy to read. His eye is observant; and his knowledge of medieval history, whether in Rome or in his native land, helps to explain the understanding and affectionate heart which reports what he sees. "For us Protestants in these later days," he says (p. 154), "it is doubtless not always easy to understand all this. But for him who enters into the significance of the medieval temple of worship and learns to comprehend its language of picture and symbol there opens a world which rewards the effort to see and to know."

In that spirit he visits both "our oldest cathedral," Lund, and many other historic houses of worship. In other lands, notably in France, churches were customarily orientated along an east-west axis, and even in Sweden the same was done as to churches of the mendicant orders. But the common practice in Sweden was to build churches facing the south. "This was probably not only that worshippers might assemble in the light and warmth—but because of the deep-rooted fear of the church's north side; for it was believed that the demons were active there, right up to the church's wall. . . . For that reason, too, there were as a rule no windows there; but the unbroken stone wall stood as a mighty shield against the powers of darkness" (pp. 158-159).

Out in many towns, churches were also built as fortresses against possible human foes. For that reason they had small and narrow doors, set in heavy walls. They were made of heavy planks, bound with heavy iron bands.

Everywhere there is that which speaks of yesterday's church: St. Clara Church in Stockholm, which roots back in Sweden's first cloister of the nuns of St. Clara; the famous Riddarholm in Stockholm, which traces back to the city's first Franciscan monastery; along the Vätter Lake the scene of the first Cistercian monastery, and, at Alvastra, the abode of St. Birgitta; and, in like manner, many other places of venerable significance.

Nevertheless, great as is the author's interest in medieval history, he does not write in undiscerning admiration of mere antiquity. The last two chapters of the book—"Liturgy and Art," and "Modern Church Building"—insist that both liturgy and architecture must always be judged by the church's faith, and especially by the church's understanding of its service of worship. For instance, tradition alone must not be determinative of liturgy. Liturgy's use of art must be true to the church's concept of worship. There have been decadent periods when liturgical practice has tended to become "empty decorations without connection with a pulsating liturgical vitality" (p. 187).

Likewise, church architecture should neither be approved or condemned solely because it is either old or modern. The primary concern should be neither form nor style, but function. The regulative consideration must be the service of worship (p. 95). Architecture in the Lutheran church must "preserve that which is religiously valid, and reject such elements as are incompatible with the evangelical understanding of the church, above all the concept of the mass as a sacrifice—and of transubstantiation" (p. 195).

"The chief Sunday service is the mass—with communion; and in this frame the preaching of the Word of God has its place" (p. 196); and "there is to be no celebration of the mass if there be no guests to come to the Lord's Table" (p. 197). In that event "only a preaching service should be held" (p. 197).

In the period of Rationalism the liturgical tradition of the Reformation was watered down; and the rest of the service came to be a ceremonial setting for the sermon. Indeed, the service tended to omit the communion altogether. Even today the church lives in the shadow of this impoverishment.

But there is now a reawakening sense of the central place of the Holy Communion in the church's worship. "The church is the meeting place for Christ and his assembly" (p. 198). For that reason the church must be built as a real communion-church. The church must not be thought of as primarily an "auditorium." The celebration of the Holy Communion is central. It may well be that, for that purpose, neither honored traditional ecclesiastical architecture nor the secular

modernist style will be best. But if architecture be true to its real function, the resulting style will win for itself as respected a place as that which any style, honored now by tradition, has ever won.

In conclusion, the reviewer would merely call attention to the fact that there is expressed in this book a position as to the relative—not to say unequal—centrality of Word and Sacrament. On this point not all Lutherans would agree in their understanding of the doctrine of the Word and the Sacraments. But our purpose has been to present the mind of the author—and to confess both pleasure and profit in reading his work.

CARL C. RASMUSSEN

New World Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. By The New World Bible Translation Committee. New York: Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 1953.

This is a translation of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges and Ruth from the Masoretic text by the Jehovah's Witnesses. In the foreword, they express the conviction that Jehovah's people should translate his Book for their own use. In many places, it is a rather free translation. They have not departed from the Masoretic text to the extent that one could say it is a false translation. One cannot escape the impression that they have sought to make it sufficiently different from all authorized translations so that their followers will feel that this is their unique book and not to be identified with the Old Testament of other religious groups. They intimate as much in the foreword.

Instead of the familiar expression in Exodus 20:5: "I, the Lord, thy God am a jealous God," they render it: "I Jehovah your God am a God exacting exclusive devotion." Then in Genesis 1:2, we meet this translation: "God's active force was moving to and fro over the surface of the waters." As over against the Revised Standard Version, there is nothing in this translation to tempt or commend it to Bible readers.

JOHN V. HALVORSON

The Long Quest. By Harry Harrison Kroll. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954. 192 pages. $2.50.

This is an historical novel dealing with the early life of John Wesley up to and including his famous Aldersgate Street experience. The author stays reasonably well within the bounds of history. Much attention is given to his disappointing romantic experiences, especially in relation to Sophia Hopkey. The story emphasizes Wesley's personal inadequacies and failings in this period of his life in connection with his quest for a vital faith. The book is interestingly written, although occasionally tending to be overdramatic, and is especially adapted for young people.

EUGENE L. FEVOLD

Facing the Cross. By Stanley D. Schneider and others. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1955. $2.50.

Our Hearts Rejoice. Compiled by John E. Meyer. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1955. $2.

The first of these two volumes has been compiled with pastors in mind and many of them will find it helpful when planning Lenten preaching. It contains "sketches," or condensations in outline form, of fourteen series of Lenten sermons. No pastor would expect to be able to use any of this material in its entirety, but you might well decide that, for an idea here and an illustration there, this book would be a useful addition to your library.

The second volume, a collection of Communion meditations, will have a wider appeal. It might profitably be used as an aid to private devotion before receiving the Lord's Supper. Pastors will welcome it for the help it offers for the important homiletical task of interpreting this Sacrament and guiding worshippers in preparing themselves to receive it.

Though no less than twenty-four authors have contributed to it, this book is comprehensive in its treatment of its subject and not unprofitably repetitious. Due emphasis is given to the communicant's faith and attitudes throughout "a searching prep-

aration," "a joyful reception," and "a dedicated departure," as well as to a theological interpretation of the Supper as a "Means of Grace." While lacking, for the most part, the readability of a book like J. B. Phillips' *Appointment With God,* it is quite consistently well-written. It is a good book, all around, and the Church will be strengthened if it is as widely read as it deserves to be.

I did wonder, as I read it, whether the devotional purpose of the book is well served by the apologetic note in several of the meditations. That we must attempt the exposition and defense of distinctive Lutheran teaching with regard to the Sacrament we would all agree. The question I would raise is whether a "Communion meditation" is the most appropriate time and place for this.

After reading these "apologies" I was left with the uneasy feeling I have had before that we sometimes fail, especially in our polemic, to take sufficiently into account the variety of thought and devotion within the Reformed churches. When you have committed yourself to the generalizations: "Over against the Reformed churches which see in the Sacrament a mere symbolism of Christ's body and His blood, we Lutherans hold to the doctrine of the 'real presence' . . ." (pp. 49, 50); "The Reformed Churches believe that the entire service is symbolic and a memorial . . ." (p. 77)—what do you make of such "Reformed" views as those of J. B. Phillips, who writes, "Here (in the Sacrament), by His appointment, I can receive and absorb things that are physical and know that they are really things which are spiritual. It is no mere piece of bread or sip of wine that I receive—I receive the very Body and Blood of Christ into my own imperfect self." (Appointment With God, p. 36)? These words sound very much like the statement by Dr. O. P. Kretzmann on page 97 of *Our Hearts Rejoice:* "In God's own mysterious way the simple bread and wine become truly the body and blood of the Savior of the world." Unless we dare assume that men like J. B. Phillips either do not know or do not mean what they say, must we not recognize more than one "Reformed view" on the Lord's Supper if our "apology" is to be either convincing or fair? If we identify a third, Anglican or Episcopal, non-Roman position—(I personally suspect it is held in other Protestant Communions, too)—ought we not to acknowledge that more generally than we have?

As does most anyone who writes or preaches about the Lord's Supper, several of the writers of meditations in this book have trouble at times stating exactly what it is we mean when we speak of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Anyone who has tried to do that will appreciate the difficulty and agree with him who writes, "What, then, is the meaning of our teaching concerning the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament? It is easier to describe what it is not than to describe what it is" (p. 90). Yet one cannot help but wish that when we attempt to say exactly what we mean by a statement like "the simple bread and wine become truly the body and blood of the Savior," we might manage to do better than just to say that the Real Presence is *not* physical and it is *not* "merely spiritual."

Especially in these days when Lutherans, practicing "closed Communion," are being inescapably drawn into ecumenical discussion, if not in the World Council of Churches, then surely in the local community, a clear understanding and a precise definition of any distinctive doctrinal position become urgently necessary both from a theological and a practical point of view. Some readers may feel that it is a weakness of this volume that it is not quite as clear and precise at this point as they would like it to be.

Nevertheless, I repeat, this is a good book. It will well repay the thoughtful and reverent reader. I would highly recommend it as an aid to preaching and for devotional use.

The introduction of the authors, in the closing pages, adds to one's appreciation of the volume. (This would be a welcome addition to the contents of *Facing the Cross.*) It is heartening to find that one of the devotional gems in the collection, written in a moving style reminiscent of Steinhaeuser, was contributed by a layman.

LOWELL O. LARSON

The Social Sources of Denominationalism. By H. Richard Niebuhr. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, 1954. 304 pages. $4.

Students of theological symbolics and social ethics, as well as those interested in the ecumenical movement, will welcome the reprinting of this book, first published twenty-five years ago. Its demonstration of the historical, economic and social factors in American denominationalism was in its time a salutary shock for churchmen, especially for those accustomed to thinking that all ecclesiastical divisions are primarily theological in character. Since then studies in sociology of religion and denominational history have reinforced Professor Niebuhr's thesis and caused widespread acceptance of it. But the task is by no means completed, and this book remains a valuable tool in its field. The more conservative church groups have perhaps greatest need of this book and others like it to achieve a healthy self-evaluation and avoid the dangers of theological pride. It should be noted that the author himself points out in the preface to the new edition that changes in his own theological perspective as well as insights from new studies make desirable a revised edition rather than a reprint. A revision would indeed be welcome, but it is cause for gratitude to have this book in print once again.

Luther's Werke. Band V. Edited by Erich Vogelsang. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1955. 434 pages. D.M. 8.

One of the most useful editions of Luther's works for the serious student is the eight volume Berlin edition of which this is the seventh volume to be reprinted since 1950. The volumes are well printed, the texts are well chosen and carefully edited, and at about two dollars per volume the price is remarkably low.

Volume V contains a selection of Luther's work from 1509 to 1518. It includes portions of the exegetical lectures on Psalms, Romans, Galatians and Hebrews, selections from the marginal notes on Augustine, Peter Lombard, and Tauler, the Disputations of 1516-17, the Heidelberg Disputation of 1518 and seven early sermons.

The introductions are concise and helpful, giving the historical setting of the work, the sources of the text, and brief bibliographies. In most cases the text is that of the Weimar edition, but the selections from the lectures on Psalms actually give more complete paleographical references than volumes 3 and 4 of the Weimar edition.

It is to be hoped that this excellent and inexpensive edition may stimulate American students to acquire the linguistic skills necessary for serious study of Luther's theology.

The English Mediaeval Parish Church. By G. H. Cook. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. 302 pages. $7.50.

Mr. Cook, author of the excellent English Cathedral Series, and *Medieval Chantries and Chantry Chapels,* continues in this volume his survey of church architecture in England. He presents an interesting discussion of the founding and development of the English parish, and of the planning, construction, and furnishing of the parish church. The book is illustrated with 54 plans and 180 excellent photographs, covering the entire range from Saxon buildings to Perpendicular and from towers to carved bosses. The illustrations alone provide a good introduction to English church architecture. In addition the book contains a bibliography and a glossary of architectural terms.

The book is of value not only to one interested in church building, but to the student of history and literature of mediaeval England as well. Mr. Cook places his discussion of church architecture in the context of the mediaeval parish and the life of its time. This is no arid lecture on architectural engineering but a fascinating presentation of the English community as it is reflected in its work of building the parish church.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

The archivist of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Dr. Harvey D. Hoover, reports that back files of Volume I, Numbers 1, 2, and 3, are completely exhausted. Since these numbers are desperately needed, the Circulation Manager is offering to extend the donor's subscription for two numbers in return for any of the back issues listed above. Anyone willing to enter into such an exchange will please communicate with Dr. Paul M. Lindberg, Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois.